Before the COPYRIGHT ROYALTY BOARD LIBRARY OF CONGRESS Washington, D.C.

In the matter of:

The Digital Performance Right | Docket No. in Sound Recordings and Ephemeral Recordings CRB DTRA

2005-1

(Webcasting Rate Adjustment Proceeding)

Volume XLIV

Room LM-414 Library of Congress First & Independence Avenue, S.E. Washington, D.C. 20540

Monday, November 27, 2006

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m.

BEFORE:

THE HONORABLE JAMES SLEDGE, Chief Judge THE HONORABLE WILLIAM J. ROBERTS, JR., Judge THE HONORABLE STAN WISNIEWSKI, Judge

Page 4 Page 2 On Behalf of Digital Media Assoc. (DiMA), AOL, Live365, Microsoft Corp., **APPEARANCES** On Behalf of Sound Exchange Yahoo! Inc., National Public Radio DAVID A. HANDZO, ESQ KENNETH L. STEINTHAL, ESQ Weil Gotshal & Manges LLP CRAIG A. COWIE, ESO 201 Redwood Shores Parkway JARED O. FREEDMAN, ESQ Redwood Shores CA 94065 (650) 802-3100 THOMAS J. PERRELLI, ESQ kenneth.steinthal@weil.com PAUL M. SMITH, ESO Jenner & Block DAVID TAYLOR, ESO Weil Gotshal & Manges 601 Thirteenth Street, N.W. 1300 Eye Street, N.W. Suite 1200 South Suite 900 Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 682-7024 Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 639-6060 dhandzo@jenner.com TODD LARSON, ESQ Weil Gotshal & Manges 567 5th Avenue GARY R. GREENSTEIN, ESO General Counsel New York, New York 10016 SoundExchange (212) 310-8238 ROBERT G. SUGARMAN, ESQ 1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. WILLIAM R. CRUSE, ESQ Suite 330 Weil, Gotshal & Manges 767 Fifth Avenue Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 828-0126 New York, New York 10153 (212) 310-8184 greenstein@soundexchange.com On Behalf of National Public Radio On Behalf of AccuRadio, Inc. (NPR), NPR Member Stations, CPB-Discombobulated LLC, Digitally Imported Inc., mvyradio.com LLC, Radioio.com LLC, Qualified Public Radio Stations Radio Paradise Inc., 3WK LLC, Educational DENISE B. LEARY, ESQ Media Foundation Foundation
DAVID D. OXENFORD, ESQ
Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 450
Washington DC 20005
202.508.6656 635 Massachusetts Ave., NW Washington DC 20001 202.513.2049 dleary@npr.org (202) 513-2049 davidoxenford@dwt.com Page 3 Page 5 On Behalf of Collegiate Broadcasters On Behalf of The National Religious Broadcasters Noncommercial Music License Inc. (CBI) SÉTH D. GREENSTEIN, ESO Committee, Bonneville International Corp., TODD ANDERSON, ESQ Clear Channel Communications Inc., Salem RICH DUMAS-EYMARD, ESQ Communications Corp., Susquehanna Radio Constantine Cannon Corp., The National Religious Broadcasters 1627 Eye Street, N.W. Music License Committee Washington, D.C. 20006 BRUCE G. JOSEPH, ESQ (202) 240-3514 KARYN ABLIN, ESQ sgreenstein@constantinecannon.com MATT ASTLE, ESQ WILL ROBEDEE MARGARET RYAN, ESQ 6100 South Main Street SETH WOOD, ESQ MS-529 Wiley Rein & Fielding Houston TX 77005 1776 K. Street, N.W. (713) 348-2935 Washington, D.C. 20006 willr@ktru.org (202) 719-4913 On Behalf of Royalty Logic, Inc. bjoseph@wrf.com KENNETH D. FREUNDLICH, ESQ. Schleimer & Freundlich, LLP On Behalf of SBR Creative Media 9100 Wilshire Boulevard DAVID RAHN Suite 615 - East Tower SBR Creative Media Beverly Hills, California 90212 7464 Arapahoe Road (310) 273-9807 Suite B4 kfreundlich@earthlink.com Boulder, Colorado 80303 (303) 444-7700 On Behalf of Intercollegiate dave@sbrcreative.com Broadcasting System Inc., Harvard Radio Broadcasting Co. Inc. On Behalf of the Radio Music License WILLIAM MALONE, ESQ Committee MATTHEW K. SCHETTENHELM, ESQ ALAN J. WEINSCHEL, ESQ Miller & Van Eaton PLLC Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP 1155 Connecticut Ave., NW 767 Fifth Avenue New York, New York 10153 #1000 (212) 310-8550 Washington DC 20036-4306 202.785.0600

alan.weinshcel@weil.com

:::

wmalone@millervaneaton.com

		1	1
1	Page 6		Page 8
	I-N-D-E-X Witness Direct Cross Redirect Recross	1	BY MR. HANDZO:
•	M. Pelcovits 6 275	2	Q For the record, would you tell us
	By Mr. Steinthal 64 281 Services Rebuttal	3	your name?
	Exhibit No. Document Mark Recd	4	A Yes. Michael P. Pelcovits.
	R-25 Pelcovits deposition 71	5	Q And where are you employed, Dr.
	*	6	Pelcovits?
	R-26 Sony BMG-Verizon 99 Ring Tones Agreement	7	A I'm employed by the consulting
		8	firm of Mike MECRA in Washington, D.C.
	R-27 Yahoo-Sony Short Form 193 Agreement	9	Q And what does MERCA stand for?
	R-28 NPD Data Table 220	10	A Mecra Economic Consulting and
	SX003149 R-29 NPD Date Table 231	11	Research Associates.
	SX003145	12	Q And you are an economist?
	R-30 NPD Date Table 236	13	A I am.
	SX003097-8, 3109-10	14	Q And you testified previously?
	R-31 9/19/06 McQuillan to 238	15	A I have.
	Pelcovits email, re:	16	MR. HANDZO: Your Honor, Dr.
1	Digital Music Study - Add'l Methodology Info	17	Pelcovits was accepted an expert previously
	R-32 NPD Questionnaire 244 260	18	with respect to applied microeconomics. I
	SX REB003117-18	19	would offer him again on that basis.
l	R-33 NPD Date Table 254	20	CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Any objection
	SX REB003113-14 R-34 NPD Date Table 269	21	to Dr. Pelcovits testifying as an expert in
Į	SX003099-100	22	microeconomics?
_			Y
1	Doga 7		Page 0
1	Page 7 P-R-O-C-F-F-D-I-N-G-S	1	Page 9 (No response.)
1 2	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S	1 2	(No response.)
2	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9:34 a.m.	2	(No response.) CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Without
2 3	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9:34 a.m. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the	l	(No response.)
2 3 4	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9:34 a.m. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the record. Welcome everyone back on the weekend	2 3	(No response.) CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Without objection he's accepted. BY MR. HANDZO:
2 3 4 5	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9:34 a.m. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the record. Welcome everyone back on the weekend of Thanksgiving.	2 3 4	(No response.) CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Without objection he's accepted. BY MR. HANDZO: Q Dr. Pelcovits, you have a massive
2 3 4 5 6	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9:34 a.m. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the record. Welcome everyone back on the weekend of Thanksgiving. MR. HANDZO: We are thankful to be	2 3 4 5	(No response.) CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Without objection he's accepted. BY MR. HANDZO:
2 3 4 5 6 7	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9:34 a.m. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the record. Welcome everyone back on the weekend of Thanksgiving.	2 3 4 5 6	(No response.) CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Without objection he's accepted. BY MR. HANDZO: Q Dr. Pelcovits, you have a massive notebook in front of you. Could you just open
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9:34 a.m. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the record. Welcome everyone back on the weekend of Thanksgiving. MR. HANDZO: We are thankful to be back. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Handzo.	2 3 4 5 6 7	(No response.) CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Without objection he's accepted. BY MR. HANDZO: Q Dr. Pelcovits, you have a massive notebook in front of you. Could you just open that up and identify the first document for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9:34 a.m. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the record. Welcome everyone back on the weekend of Thanksgiving. MR. HANDZO: We are thankful to be back. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Handzo. MR. HANDZO: Thank you, Your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	(No response.) CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Without objection he's accepted. BY MR. HANDZO: Q Dr. Pelcovits, you have a massive notebook in front of you. Could you just open that up and identify the first document for us?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9:34 a.m. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the record. Welcome everyone back on the weekend of Thanksgiving. MR. HANDZO: We are thankful to be back. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Handzo. MR. HANDZO: Thank you, Your Honor. Before I begin with Dr. Pelcovits, our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(No response.) CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Without objection he's accepted. BY MR. HANDZO: Q Dr. Pelcovits, you have a massive notebook in front of you. Could you just open that up and identify the first document for us? A Yes, the first document is a copy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9:34 a.m. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the record. Welcome everyone back on the weekend of Thanksgiving. MR. HANDZO: We are thankful to be back. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Handzo. MR. HANDZO: Thank you, Your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(No response.) CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Without objection he's accepted. BY MR. HANDZO: Q Dr. Pelcovits, you have a massive notebook in front of you. Could you just open that up and identify the first document for us? A Yes, the first document is a copy of my prefiled rebuttal testimony in this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9:34 a.m. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the record. Welcome everyone back on the weekend of Thanksgiving. MR. HANDZO: We are thankful to be back. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Handzo. MR. HANDZO: Thank you, Your Honor. Before I begin with Dr. Pelcovits, our schedule tomorrow just to clarify the witness	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	(No response.) CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Without objection he's accepted. BY MR. HANDZO: Q Dr. Pelcovits, you have a massive notebook in front of you. Could you just open that up and identify the first document for us? A Yes, the first document is a copy of my prefiled rebuttal testimony in this case.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9:34 a.m. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the record. Welcome everyone back on the weekend of Thanksgiving. MR. HANDZO: We are thankful to be back. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Handzo. MR. HANDZO: Thank you, Your Honor. Before I begin with Dr. Pelcovits, our schedule tomorrow just to clarify the witness order will begin with Ms. Kessler, followed by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	(No response.) CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Without objection he's accepted. BY MR. HANDZO: Q Dr. Pelcovits, you have a massive notebook in front of you. Could you just open that up and identify the first document for us? A Yes, the first document is a copy of my prefiled rebuttal testimony in this case. Q Dr. Pelcovits, could you just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9:34 a.m. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the record. Welcome everyone back on the weekend of Thanksgiving. MR. HANDZO: We are thankful to be back. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Handzo. MR. HANDZO: Thank you, Your Honor. Before I begin with Dr. Pelcovits, our schedule tomorrow just to clarify the witness order will begin with Ms. Kessler, followed by Mr. Wheeler and Mr. Lee.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	(No response.) CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Without objection he's accepted. BY MR. HANDZO: Q Dr. Pelcovits, you have a massive notebook in front of you. Could you just open that up and identify the first document for us? A Yes, the first document is a copy of my prefiled rebuttal testimony in this case. Q Dr. Pelcovits, could you just quickly kind of refresh us on the benchmark
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9:34 a.m. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the record. Welcome everyone back on the weekend of Thanksgiving. MR. HANDZO: We are thankful to be back. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Handzo. MR. HANDZO: Thank you, Your Honor. Before I begin with Dr. Pelcovits, our schedule tomorrow just to clarify the witness order will begin with Ms. Kessler, followed by Mr. Wheeler and Mr. Lee. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	(No response.) CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Without objection he's accepted. BY MR. HANDZO: Q Dr. Pelcovits, you have a massive notebook in front of you. Could you just open that up and identify the first document for us? A Yes, the first document is a copy of my prefiled rebuttal testimony in this case. Q Dr. Pelcovits, could you just quickly kind of refresh us on the benchmark analysis that provided in your opening
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9:34 a.m. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the record. Welcome everyone back on the weekend of Thanksgiving. MR. HANDZO: We are thankful to be back. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Handzo. MR. HANDZO: Thank you, Your Honor. Before I begin with Dr. Pelcovits, our schedule tomorrow just to clarify the witness order will begin with Ms. Kessler, followed by Mr. Wheeler and Mr. Lee. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Thank you. MR. HANDZO: Sound Exchange calls	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(No response.) CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Without objection he's accepted. BY MR. HANDZO: Q Dr. Pelcovits, you have a massive notebook in front of you. Could you just open that up and identify the first document for us? A Yes, the first document is a copy of my prefiled rebuttal testimony in this case. Q Dr. Pelcovits, could you just quickly kind of refresh us on the benchmark analysis that provided in your opening testimony in this case?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9:34 a.m. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the record. Welcome everyone back on the weekend of Thanksgiving. MR. HANDZO: We are thankful to be back. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Handzo. MR. HANDZO: Thank you, Your Honor. Before I begin with Dr. Pelcovits, our schedule tomorrow just to clarify the witness order will begin with Ms. Kessler, followed by Mr. Wheeler and Mr. Lee. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Thank you. MR. HANDZO: Sound Exchange calls as its next witness Dr. Michael Pelcovits.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	(No response.) CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Without objection he's accepted. BY MR. HANDZO: Q Dr. Pelcovits, you have a massive notebook in front of you. Could you just open that up and identify the first document for us? A Yes, the first document is a copy of my prefiled rebuttal testimony in this case. Q Dr. Pelcovits, could you just quickly kind of refresh us on the benchmark analysis that provided in your opening testimony in this case? A Yes, in the opening case I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9:34 a.m. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the record. Welcome everyone back on the weekend of Thanksgiving. MR. HANDZO: We are thankful to be back. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Handzo. MR. HANDZO: Thank you, Your Honor. Before I begin with Dr. Pelcovits, our schedule tomorrow just to clarify the witness order will begin with Ms. Kessler, followed by Mr. Wheeler and Mr. Lee. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Thank you. MR. HANDZO: Sound Exchange calls as its next witness Dr. Michael Pelcovits. Whereupon,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	(No response.) CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Without objection he's accepted. BY MR. HANDZO: Q Dr. Pelcovits, you have a massive notebook in front of you. Could you just open that up and identify the first document for us? A Yes, the first document is a copy of my prefiled rebuttal testimony in this case. Q Dr. Pelcovits, could you just quickly kind of refresh us on the benchmark analysis that provided in your opening testimony in this case? A Yes, in the opening case I proposed that the Court use a benchmark
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9:34 a.m. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the record. Welcome everyone back on the weekend of Thanksgiving. MR. HANDZO: We are thankful to be back. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Handzo. MR. HANDZO: Thank you, Your Honor. Before I begin with Dr. Pelcovits, our schedule tomorrow just to clarify the witness order will begin with Ms. Kessler, followed by Mr. Wheeler and Mr. Lee. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Thank you. MR. HANDZO: Sound Exchange calls as its next witness Dr. Michael Pelcovits. Whereupon, MICHAEL PELCOVITS was called as a witness by the counsel for Sound Exchange, and having been first duly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	(No response.) CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Without objection he's accepted. BY MR. HANDZO: Q Dr. Pelcovits, you have a massive notebook in front of you. Could you just open that up and identify the first document for us? A Yes, the first document is a copy of my prefiled rebuttal testimony in this case. Q Dr. Pelcovits, could you just quickly kind of refresh us on the benchmark analysis that provided in your opening testimony in this case? A Yes, in the opening case I proposed that the Court use a benchmark approach to set the rates in this proceeding and I proposed to use the interactive webcasting market as the benchmark. I propose
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9:34 a.m. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the record. Welcome everyone back on the weekend of Thanksgiving. MR. HANDZO: We are thankful to be back. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Handzo. MR. HANDZO: Thank you, Your Honor. Before I begin with Dr. Pelcovits, our schedule tomorrow just to clarify the witness order will begin with Ms. Kessler, followed by Mr. Wheeler and Mr. Lee. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Thank you. MR. HANDZO: Sound Exchange calls as its next witness Dr. Michael Pelcovits. Whereupon, MICHAEL PELCOVITS was called as a witness by the counsel for Sound Exchange, and having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	(No response.) CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Without objection he's accepted. BY MR. HANDZO: Q Dr. Pelcovits, you have a massive notebook in front of you. Could you just open that up and identify the first document for us? A Yes, the first document is a copy of my prefiled rebuttal testimony in this case. Q Dr. Pelcovits, could you just quickly kind of refresh us on the benchmark analysis that provided in your opening testimony in this case? A Yes, in the opening case I proposed that the Court use a benchmark approach to set the rates in this proceeding and I proposed to use the interactive webcasting market as the benchmark. I propose that because I believe that the interactive
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9:34 a.m. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the record. Welcome everyone back on the weekend of Thanksgiving. MR. HANDZO: We are thankful to be back. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Handzo. MR. HANDZO: Thank you, Your Honor. Before I begin with Dr. Pelcovits, our schedule tomorrow just to clarify the witness order will begin with Ms. Kessler, followed by Mr. Wheeler and Mr. Lee. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Thank you. MR. HANDZO: Sound Exchange calls as its next witness Dr. Michael Pelcovits. Whereupon, MICHAEL PELCOVITS was called as a witness by the counsel for Sound Exchange, and having been first duly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	(No response.) CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Without objection he's accepted. BY MR. HANDZO: Q Dr. Pelcovits, you have a massive notebook in front of you. Could you just open that up and identify the first document for us? A Yes, the first document is a copy of my prefiled rebuttal testimony in this case. Q Dr. Pelcovits, could you just quickly kind of refresh us on the benchmark analysis that provided in your opening testimony in this case? A Yes, in the opening case I proposed that the Court use a benchmark approach to set the rates in this proceeding and I proposed to use the interactive webcasting market as the benchmark. I propose

Page 10

10

respect to a number of characteristics, including similar buyers, similar sellers.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

l 19

21

22

20

Many aspects of the use for the music are similar. The single dissimilarity is the absence of interactivity in the statutory market and I've proposed an adjustment to take account of that.

Now in your benchmark analysis, did you address the possibility that the benchmark market, the interactive market, might substitute for CD sales to a greater or lesser degree than your target market, the market for DMCA compliant webcasting?

Yes, I did. I did consider that factor in my testimony.

And when you say you considered it, what exactly did you do?

What I did is I performed a sensitivity analysis to show the effects of a certain level of difference in substitutability between the benchmark and the target markets and show the effect that it

1 these two services?

> 2 I have found evidence on a number 3 of different aspects of promotion and substitution. With respect to promotion, I 4 5 have looked at the data on the use of the buy 6 buttons by various music services. With 7 respect to substitution, I have provided and 8 presented data from a survey conducted by NPD. 9

Let me start with NPD data. First of all, who or what is NPD?

11 NPD is a large survey firm that has been in business for about 40 years and 12 13 conducts surveys of a wide range of consumer 14 goods including music services, music 15 purchases.

16 And how did you find out that NPD 17 has some relevant data?

18 It was quite by accident. I asked 19 one of my research assistants to dig, continue 20 to dig, in this area and see what he could 21 find and he found a press report on an NPD 22 survey and it was really the first and only

Page 11

would have on the rates that I recommended.

And what level of difference did you use for your sensitivity analysis?

I used a difference of two CD purchases per year per customer.

So in other words, the interactive market would cause a substitution of two CD per year more than the non-interactive target market?

Correct. That's what I did. A

Now are you aware that the webcast services in their direct case presented evidence regarding promotion and substitution in those markets?

A Yes.

Q And is that a topic that you've explored further in your rebuttal testimony?

I have. I've explored that further after reviewing what I've seen in the case so far.

What evidence have you found on the issue of promotion substitution as between Page 13

1 thing I had seen which quantified or attempted 2 or I would say could be used to try to 3 quantify the extent to which there was 4 substitution for music purchases by customers

of various types of music services on the 6 internet.

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

Did you arrange to obtain access Q 8 to some of the NPD survey data?

I did.

Q Now generally what kinds of questions did the NPD survey ask?

In this particular survey, they asked questions on use of various types of digital music, their subscription to music services, webcasting, purchases of digital downloads, file sharing, CD burning as well as purchases of recorded music either through CDs or downloads.

19 Q Do you know when that survey was 20 conducted?

21 Yes. It was conducted in December 22 of last year, 2005.

Q And do you know generally speaking how it was conducted?

A Yes. The way it was conducted, it's called an internet survey. There's a large pool of respondents or potential panelists that NPD turns to and it sends those respondents what's called a web survey. It's a survey that's conducted entirely through responses electronically back and forth between the survey group and the respondents.

Q Do you know what the size of the respondent group was for this survey?

A Yes. There were about 4,000, I think a little bit over 4,000 responses.

Q And do you know what efforts, if any, NPD make sure that its survey respondents match the U.S. demographics?

A Well, that's essentially their business and that's what they do by both determining who they send the survey out to. They have to gather and maintain data on the demographics of the panelists and on the

average number of CDs purchased by customers who respond to a question "Do you listen to a

certain type of music on the internet" and then you would get the actual average response

for the customers that fall in that particular category.

Q And what did you do with the NPD data?

A What I did is I looked at the data to try to get some sense of the effect of subscription to a either interactive music service on the one hand or to a webcast, in this case, a free webcast service on the other hand and to see to what extent the customers and the respondents said that they changed their purchases of recorded music as they signed up to one of these services.

Q And were you able to actually perform that analysis?

A I was able to use the data, I would say, to get very indications of what was going on here.

Page 15

respondents to try to get as good as they can a representative sample of the U.S. population.

Q By the way, how do you know how they do what they do?

A I had several discussions with the personnel at NPD, people involved in survey design and stats, statistical issues and that's what we discussed and essentially their approach and their efforts was consistent with what I've learned about a lot of different survey firms that essentially do this on a regular, professional basis.

Q What exactly did you receive from NPD?

A I received from them what's called "cross tabs" which essentially turns out to be just a large Excel spreadsheet which gives the purchases of CDs and other types of recorded music by the respondents to the survey broken down based on their responses to other questions. So for example, it would give the

Page I

1 Q If you wouldn't mind, please turn 2 to page 27 of your written testimony and 3 you'll see a table there that says "Results 4 from NPD Survey of Digital Music."

A Yes.

Q I take it that reflects the results of your analysis.

A That is the results of my analysis.

Q Now the top half of that chart is headed "Subscribed to a Digital Music Service." Do you see that?

A Yes.

Q And what does the digital music service represent to you?

A Digital music service is the best that it's possible to categorize these things, these are the interactive services that formed my benchmark market in my rate proposal.

Q And how do you know that the respondents who said they subscribe to a digital music service are using an on-demand

Page 17

Ļ:. \.

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

or an interactive service?

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

Right. Well, they never ask that question directly. So some of the this is inference but they were asked how much they paid for the service on a monthly basis and these are respondents, this excludes respondents who paid less than five dollars a month because those could potentially be subscribers to the non-interactive webcasts. So I wanted to exclude those customers. These are the remaining subscribers to a digital music service and the other very powerful indication here is that the question in the survey included as examples, the Rhapsody I believe, and I don't remember one other music

Q But those are interactive services?

19 A Yes.

service.

And do you know if the survey separately asked about download services?

It did ask about download

1

2005. People who subscribed for less than one year began to subscribe in 2005.

Yes, that would be the logical implication of what the survey says.

Okay. And then you have in the line that says less than one year, you have some numbers under 2004 and 2005.

> A Right.

Q What does those represent?

Okay. Let me explain what I'm doing here. I think in general what I'm trying to do is to see what happens to the respondents' purchases of CDs in a before and after world. So looking at the survey and in this case we're looking at the group that subscribed to the interactive services.

CDs they purchased in 2005 and they are also asked how many they purchased in 2004. For the customers in this first row here, the less-than-one-year customers, as I just said we know that those are customers who began to

The customers are asked how many

Page 19

services. I believe the questions were clearly differentiated enough so when the customer said "I subscribe to a music service" the customer or the respondent was not confusing that with a service where the only money they were spending was to buy digital downloads. This was a subscription service.

Right. Now right below that, you have categories of less than one year and more than one year. What does that represent?

One of the questions they asked is how long have you been a subscriber to the service. So I divided. They actually broke it down into a lot of smaller categories, I forget exactly, three to five months, five months to seven months, that type of breakdown. I aggregated that to two different categories, one customers who had subscribed for less than one year and the other category, those that had subscribed for more than one year.

Q So the survey was in December of Page 21

use an interactive music service in 2005. So

2 we know that 2004 is a before snapshot and

3 2005 is at least partially if not entirely

4 depending on how long the customer has been a

5 subscriber is an after snapshot. So this says

6 these customers on average purchased 5.7 CDs 7 in 2004, 5.5 CDs in 2005. The different which

is the last column is -0.2 CDs per year.

And so that represents from the survey data the effect on CD purchases of subscribing to one of these services.

Yes.

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Joseph. MR. JOSEPH: Objection. Leading. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Sustained. BY MR. HANDZO:

What does that represent? Q

18 Well, that represents essentially 19 the change between before and after and would 20 be an indication of whether subscription to 21 the music service caused a change. In this 22 case, we're trying to see whether it led to a

Page 22

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

Page 23

significant amount of substitution between use of the music service and purchases of CDs.

JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: If I could just ask a question here. Maybe I missed something. Did you say the NPD survey was a longitudinal survey?

THE WITNESS: It was, meaning I'm

JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Meaning that in fact you have the same people participating in the survey over periods of time.

THE WITNESS: It is not, but these are questions asked of the same people "What did you buy this year? What did you buy last year?" This is not comparing two different surveys.

17 JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Okay. Thank 18 you.

19 THE WITNESS: You're welcome.

20 BY MR. HANDZO:

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15 16

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

19

21

21 Q Now in the next line you have people who subscribed to a digital music 22

1 other recorded music.

And what did you find?

I found a very small difference. There is a one CD difference here which I in fact -- This shows CD purchases. I believe that even this change is offset by an increase in purchases of digital downloads by those customers.

Q Now did you perform the same analysis with respect to people who streamed music from a free website?

> A I did.

And again, the category of Q streaming music from a free website, what does that represent here?

That represents to the best I can tell subscribers to what would be DMCA compliant services. These would be our target market. Essentially this sets up the comparison of the benchmark market to the target market.

You said subscribers. Is it O

Page 25

1 service for one year or more. Do you see 2 that?

> Yes. \mathbf{A}

And so you've also have lines that show the change there with respect to CD purchases. Do you see that?

Yes.

And do you have an opinion as to what those numbers represent?

Yes. Let me tell you what I was trying to do with this. I was just trying to see -- There's essentially a lot of data here. I'm trying to see what does it tell us. I looked at the one year or more data to try to see if it were true that over time a customer tended to reduce his CD purchases as he got more accustomed and tended to rely more on 18 listening to music on the internet through the music services. That would really be this

20 sort of an indication of a longer run adjustment and a longer run substitution of

the music service for purchases of CDs or 22

subscribers or listeners? 1

I think it is both if I recall correctly. They subscribe and listen to it. When they listen to it, they don't have to subscribe if it's free.

Right. Okay, and what about the survey questionnaire tells you that streaming music from a free website is essentially akin to listening to a webcasting service?

Well, first of all, the fact that it's free tells me that it's not one of the on-demand services and it also in the survey questionnaire gives examples of types of music services which would satisfy this noninteractivity.

Q So it gives examples of webcasting services.

A Yes.

18 19 And I take it that the analysis 20 for the webcasting services is the same as the 21 analysis for the on-demand services in terms 22 of looking at the before and after picture.

Page 26

9

10

Exactly. It's the same numerical calculations to try to again capture whether there's a before and after change in CD purchases by this group.

And what did the data show you?

Actually the data shows very \mathbf{A} similar results to the top half of the chart, to the customers in the interactive services. It shows a slight reduction in the CD purchases and essentially shows that there is no observable significant difference between customers of the interactive music services and the non-interactive music services.

No observable difference with respect to what?

Substitution of the music service for purchases of CDs.

Now going back to your testimony at the beginning of this morning, you indicated that in your original benchmark analysis you employed a sensitivity analysis that assumed two CD substitution differential

objection to purporting to draw conclusions 1

> 2 from the analysis he's presented here. But to

3 say, "And also I reviewed the data in the

different ways," we don't know what different 4

5 ways he's reviewed the data. He hasn't

6 testified to what different ways and it's not 7 in here. So we don't know enough. He didn't 8

explain any other examination.

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Handzo.

MR. HANDZO: Your Honor, I think Mr. Joseph is reading a whole lot more into

11 the answer than is really there. What I 12

13 understood him to say is that in his original

benchmark analysis he assumed that there was 14

15 a difference between interactive services and

non-interactive services with respect to 16

17 substitution. In the NPD, he looked at

18 interactive services and the degree to which

19 they cause substitution. He looked at non-

20 interactive services to the degree they cause

21 substitution and he sees that the difference

22 between the two is much less than the

Page 27

1

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

between interactive and non-interactive

services. What does this data tell you about

3 that sensitivity analysis?

direct testimony.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Well, it tells me that the two CD simulation analysis is far more generous than it needs to be, that I see no evidence at all in this survey, not only from this table, just from reviewing the results and looking at the survey and aggregating data in a lot of difference ways, I come to the conclusion that any difference between the two services is almost certainly going to be much smaller than the two CD effect that I presented in my

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Joseph.

MR. JOSEPH: Your Honor, move to strike the answer insofar as it includes comments concerning other review and analysis of the data beyond that which is presented in this testimony. You were given essentially

one comparison that Dr. Pelcovits said he was testifying about in his testimony. I have no

sensitivity analysis he used in benchmark analysis. That's all he's saying.

3 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: So you would 4 have no objection to sustaining the objection 5 to the extent that it goes beyond what is your 6 explanation.

MR. HANDZO: Yes, I don't think that would result in striking anything, but, yes, that's right.

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Joseph, does that satisfy your concern?

MR. JOSEPH: Well, Your Honor, Mr. 13 Handzo in his explanation said he looked at the NPD data. In fact, he testified about 14 looking at some very specific pieces of the 15

NPD data and making some very specific 16

comparisons. My objection does not go to any 17

18 conclusions he seeks to draw from the analysis

he presented in his written testimony. To the 19

20 extent he was saying he did more than that or

he was drawing conclusions for more than that, 21

22 that's where my objection is. Page 29

Page 33

Page 30

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: There's no dispute on that. To the extent that anything could be read into his answer beyond that, the motion would be granted.

MR. JOSEPH: Thank you, Your Honor.

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

18

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Cont'd) BY MR. HANDZO:

Q And let me just try and clarify, Dr. Pelcovits, in your answer with respect to the appropriateness of the two CD sensitivity analysis, were you relying on anything other than what's presented here in this data that you've just been discussing?

Well, the quantitative results are 16 presented right here. I did as it says in my 17 testimony I examined the survey results and as a economist and social scientist, I looked at 19 that data and obviously not just doing a 20 simple calculation. So to form my expert opinion, I was looking at the data overall and trying to see if there were anomalies or

1 claim based on the results that I have or the

2 results I've computed that I know precisely

3 what the difference as to whether it's going

4 to 0.2 or -0.3 or whatever. I cannot conclude

5 that. I can assign a statistical liability to

6 that, but the data overall in these

7 calculations give me very strong reason to

believe that my two CD substitution simulation 8

9 as I said earlier was far more generous than 10 it needed to be.

11 Q Now you also mentioned, Dr.

12 Pelcovits, that you looked at buy button data.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

7

Q And just remind what buy button data is.

Sure. Buy button data is data on purchases of either CDs or digital downloads by listeners to various webcasts. Most of the webcasts when they're playing a song give the

20 listener the ability to click on a direct link

21 to allow them to buy the music.

And where did you obtain buy

Page 31

something that would suggest that the conclusions drawn from this particular calculation were supportable and justifiable.

Did you find any anomalies that would undermine this data?

 \mathbf{A} No.

Q Did you have an opportunity to perform any statistical testing on the validity of the NPD data?

A I did not.

Q Why not?

I could not do it on my own because I did not have the raw survey results that NPD collects and so I was unable to do it myself and I did ask NPD to perform various tests and they were unwilling to.

17 Does that affect your conclusions Q 18 here?

It does not affect the general conclusions that I draw about the overall difference in substitution in the two markets compared to a two CD benchmark. I would not

1 button data from?

> 2 There is data in the course of this proceeding that has been made available to me from three different sources, from

5 AccuRadio (1), from Bonneville (2) and from

6 Yahoo (3).

> Q Okay. Let's start with AccuRadio.

8 What data did you get from AccuRadio?

9 AccuRadio reports the purchases of 10 CDs by listeners to AccuRadio via the buy

11 button. Those are purchases made on Amazon.com

12 and something for which AccuRadio receives a

13 commission.

14 And do you have data that shows 15 you how many CDs AccuRadio sold in the course of a year? 16

17 \mathbf{A} I do.

18 Q Do you recall what year that was you have the data for? 19

20 Yes, that's for 2005.

21 Q What other data did you have from

22 AccuRadio?

19 20 21

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

5

6

7

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

I also had data on their listening audience, a number of unique listeners to AccuRadio during October 2005.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

0 What did you do with that data?

What I did with the data is I took \mathbf{A} the number of CDs purchased through the buy button for 2005 and I divided that by the number of unique listeners in October 2005 making the assumption that that was a reasonable proxy for the average number of listeners throughout the year.

And what was the result of that O calculation?

A The result was that the average number of CDs purchased via the link on AccuRadio was 0.02 CDs per listener per year, so two-one hundredths of a CD per listener per year.

Now looking at the buy button data, does that tell you anything about whether webcasting services would be substitutional for CD sales or just whether

Page 36 The calculation which essentially

2 is using this data on purchases of digital 3 downloads, dividing it by the number of listeners, is a number that actually turns out 4 5 to be the same as it is for AccuRadio which

6 again is 0.02 CDs purchased per year per 7 listener.

Now you mentioned that with O Bonneville, they were selling digital downloads. Did you do a calculation to change downloads into CDs?

Yes. I did a calculation where I assumed or essentially converted downloads to CDs assuming there were ten tracks on a typical CD. So actually there were 0.2 downloads per year per listener which if you assume that's one-tenth of a CD per download that's what gives you the 0.02 CDs.

And lastly, you mentioned you had data from Yahoo. What did you get Yahoo?

What I got from Yahoo this was information from the purchases of downloads

Page 35

they tend to promote?

This would be just dealing with any promotional effect. It's not giving you any information on a substitutional effect. You very well could have a customer buy a certain number of CDs through the links, but on net that customer might buy fewer CDs in total because his desire to listen to music is being satisfied through the web service.

Now tell us about the Bonneville data that you got.

The Bonneville data is from two Bonneville stations and in this case it provides the total number of digital downloads. These are tracks. So it's not entire CDs. It's just one of the tracks on a CD. That's the total number of digital downloads during four weeks of October 2005 and I use that data to perform a similar calculation.

What were the results of that Q calculation?

and digital albums by Yahoo customers where these were Sony BMG recorded music. So I had

2 3 information on purchases of Sony BMG music by 4

Yahoo customers of all sorts.

And did you adjust that data in any way to reflect the entire market and not just the Sony BMG share?

8 Yes, I made the assumption that I 9 could take this data and essentially gross it 10 up based on the share of Sony BMG. So I want 11 to say hypothetically Sony BMG had 25 percent 12 of the market. I grossed this number put by 13 multiplying it by four.

Now I think you may have indicated this already but are these purchases just by people who are listening to Yahoo's webcasting service or is it all of Yahoo?

A It's all of Yahoo's subscription, non-subscription or even just purchasing music after not even listening to anything but simply reading about music on a Yahoo music homepage.

Page 37

Page 38

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Q And did you then sort of calculate what the average listener was buying from Yahoo?

A I did again using this gross up and working with bigger categories than ideal. But this showed an effect consistent with the other buy button data of, in this case, 0.014 CD equivalent per year, essentially albums per year.

Q Now what conclusions do you draw from the buy button data?

A I draw the conclusion that from this most direct form of what you would expect to be promotional effects the extent of the promotional effect is very, very small, essentially close to zero in terms of the effects it would have on any rate recommendation I'd be making.

Q Now is it possible that people are listening to music and want to buy it but they don't use the buy button? They do it some other way?

1 on the rate paid for music works?

A Yes, I am familiar with that.

Q And do you have an opinion about the validity of that proposed benchmark?

A Yes, I believe that this approach is not valid and not appropriate for this case.

Q Why is that?

9 A There are a number of reasons both 10 relating to, I'd say, empirical things, namely 11 facts in the market and also I have 12 disagreement with what I'd say is his overall 13 conceptual approach, his theory.

Q Let's talk about the empirical issues first. What are the empirical issues that you've identified?

A The empirical issues boil down to the fact that he presents data from only one market where musical works and sound recording copyrights are needed by the service, by the product, namely the case of music used as background in television shows or movies. So

Page 39

Page 41

A It is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

20

21

22

Q Does that affect your conclusion?

A No, I think that there still -- Since this is the most direct way for a

customer to buy the music, I would still

6 expect that if there is a significant or a 7 pronounced promotional effect it would show up

in the buy button data. It's true it could

9 indirectly lead to sales through some other

means, but there are offsetting factors which

would potentially make this an overstatement of a promotional effect.

Q Did you say "they are offsetting factors" or "there are"?

A "There are" sir.

16 Q My apologies. Switching gears17 here, Dr. Pelcovits, have you reviewed Dr.

18 Jaffe's written testimony and his oral

19 testimony in the direct phase of this case?

A I have.

Q And are you familiar with the fact that he proposes a different benchmark based

that's the one piece of evidence he relies on. He ignores several other markets which tell a very different story.

Q Now before we sort of get into those other markets, when Dr. Jaffe looks at the market for music and TV and movies, what aspect of this theory is he addressing there?

A He is making the claim that — The fundamental claim he's making is that these two rights both should and will receive the same payment in the marketplace. His basic theory is since both are needed they should both get the same amount of money.

Q And what markets did he not look at?

A He did not look at several markets including the interactive webcasting market which was the market I used as my benchmark. He did not look at the ring tone market or the digital download market, the music video market or the market for clip samples.

Q Now in those markets that you just

Page 42 Page 44 mentioned, are there any where the sound 1 So it allows the user to have a favorite song 2 played. recording rights and the musical work rights 3 are valued the same? 3 Initially, the ring tones that 4 \mathbf{A} There are none where that is the 4 were played were what are called monophonic or 5 polyphonic tunes which essentially was just 5 case. 6 the tones of a particular song. It was not 6 And which of those rights is paid Q 7 7 the actual full music as you would hear it on more? 8 The sound recording right is 8 a CD or the radio. \mathbf{A} 9 always paid more than the musical work right. 9 And when there were just those 10 Let me ask you to turn, Dr. 10 kinds of ring tones, was it necessary to have the song recording rights? 11 11 Pelcovits, to page four of your written 12 testimony and can you tell us please what the 12 No, it was not necessary because they were not playing a sound recording. They 13 chart on that page represents? 13 14 14 were just playing the notes of the music. Yes. The chart represents the 15 15 Was it necessary to have the fees paid to sound recording copyright holder 16 musical works right? 16 and the musical work copyright holder for the 17 17 five different markets that I mentioned It was. 18 earlier. 18 Do you know what compensation was 19 19 paid to the holders of the musical works right 0 Now are there any of those markets 20 20 that sort of stand out in your mind as for those tones? 21 21 particularly instructive? Yes, approximately ten percent of 22 Yes. I think again the weight of 22 the retail price of the ring tone provided to Page 43 Page 45 1 the evidence comes from the fact that these 1 the ultimate consumer. are several markets and you have quite a --2 And when cell phones were 3 3 it's quite important that you see this across developed to the point where they could 4 all markets. I think the one I look at sort 4 actually play a portion of the sound 5 5 of a good example of what we can learn about recording, what happened? 6 6 the compensation paid to the two different At that point, you needed the 7 7 copyright holders is the ring tone market. sound recording copyright and two things 8 8 Q Why is that? happened, (1) the price to the consumer 9 9 Well, the ring tone market, increased and (2) the sound recording 10 there's a lot of -- It's a relatively new 10 copyright holder had to be compensated and 11 market and we've seen significant developments 11 receive fees in the range of 50 percent of the 12 in that market and I will start sort of with 12 retail price. 13 the fact that even under a variety of changes 13 And once that happened, what was 14 14 in this market, we see this type of evidence the payment to the holder of musical work 15 presenting itself. 15 right? Now are you familiar with how the 16 16 It remained in the same range of \mathbf{A} 17 ring tone market developed? 17 about ten percent. 18 18 Yes. The ring tone market, what Now do you have an understanding, 19 we're talking here about is having your cell 19 Dr. Pelcovits, of who in this market obtains 20 20 phone play a tune instead of some one of these the rights of the musical works? 21 typical Nokia tunes or whatever else that 21 In the ring tone market, my

22

understanding is that certain cases it's

would typically be programmed into the phone.

Page 49

Page 46

negotiated by the music publisher directly and in other case and this is something that the record labels have been trying to secure, they actually secure this right from the music publisher and then they are able to offer the sound recording including the musical work license to the ring tone company.

Q And do you have an understanding of whether ring tones are considered promotional or substitutional for CD sales?

A Yes.

MR. STEINTHAL: I'm going to object on foundation grounds. There's no evidence that he did any kind of study about whether or not ring tones are promotional or substitutional.

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Handzo.
MR. HANDZO: Let me ask other
questions and lay the foundation.

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: All right. BY MR. HANDZO:

Q Dr. Pelcovits, what did you do to

and 1 considered by the recording industry to be

2 promotional or substitutional?
 3 MR. STEINTHAL: Objection, You

3 MR. STEINTHAL: Objection, Your 4 Honor.

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Handzo.

6 MR. HANDZO: Your Honor, my
7 question was whether he has an understanding
8 of what the record industry thinks and he has
9 talked to a representative of the industry.
10 Mr. Eisenberg certainly has his views.

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Objection sustained.

BY MR. HANDZO:

Q Now, Dr. Pelcovits, if you were looking for a market to see the relative values of musical works and sound recordings, how in your opinion does the ring tones market compare to the market for the use of music and TV shows and movies?

A I think it's a far better benchmark to examine this issue than the market that Dr. Jaffe looked at.

Page 47

determine how this market works and what the views of the parties are?

A I reviewed, obviously, the evidence and the written testimonies and I've spoken to Mr. Eisenberg about this market.

Q Including the point that I just raised?

A Yes.

MR. STEINTHAL: It doesn't solve my problem. There's nothing in his report about this and the fact that he has now read between his deposition, Mr. Eisenberg's testimony or somebody's testimony about a promotional value issue associated with ring tones doesn't give him the entitlement to speak to it today. It's certainly not in his report.

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: The objection is premature.

BY MR. HANDZO:

Q Do you have an understanding, Dr. Pelcovits, of whether these ring tones are

Q Why is that?

A I think this is a market where first of all the music is provided and sold directly eventually to the customer. The customer wants to listen to a particular sound recording or use it as a ring tone. So it's a direct purchase of a particular sound recording or a right to play the sound recording by the customer as opposed to the market that Dr. Jaffe relies on where there is no direct sale or evaluation of the music by the customer and that has a number of implications for, I think, how the market values these two different copyrights.

Q Now what in your view explains the results that Dr. Jaffe found in the market for movie and TV rights?

A I think what explains the uniqueness of that market, and I think that's the key thing. The reason why it is unique and different than these five other markets is that the transaction in this case between

2);

.- *

:

A Ka

Page 53

Page 50

let's say a movie producer and the copyright holders is in a setting where the music 3 producer is not as dependent or reliant on a particular sound recording, let alone of a sound recording made of a particular musical work. The movie producer has many, many 7 options available to the license of a particular sound recordings. This is an option in other markets is not something 10 that's available. 11

- For example, are you familiar with the term "cover bands"?
- \mathbf{A} I am.

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

17

18

19

20

21

14 What is that? Q

> A cover band would be using a band other than the well known band that might have made the original sound recording to make a separate sound recording of a particular musical work.

And does the availability of 0 substitutes to the sound recording in the music and TV business, would you expect that

1 whole paradigm of framework that he

- 2 establishes where he says where there are two
- 3 rights needed to use music, they are both
- 4 going to be compensated the same amount and
- 5 essentially as I understand his theory is that
- 6 since either the sound recording copyright
- 7 holder or the musical work copyright holder
- 8 can deny a user the ability to make use of a
- 9 particular piece of music. They both can keep 10
- it from happening and they both then will 11 receive and should receive the same license 12 fee.
- 13 Do you think that theory would Q 14 hold in real markets?

I do not think it would hold in real markets except in cases where there were rights established and it allowed one of those rights holders to take advantage of its ability to control the use of the music. I would regard that as being sort of a -- It's called an economic opportunistic behavior where you take advantage of a situation where

Page 51

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

7

after the fact you are needed even if before

the fact you weren't needed. On a sort of going forward basis, what would you expect to happen if the owners

4 5 of musical works tried to exercise a sort of 6 holdout power?

8 common practice where the providers of the 9 musical works to sound recordings were trying 10 to extract equal amounts of a payment from the 11 users of the music that the record companies

A I expect that if this were to be a

- 12 would not be willing to allow that separate 13
- holding of a copyright to control how the
- 14 music would be used. It could be done in a
- 15 variety of ways and there are plenty of
- 16 examples in economics where firms do things to
- 17 prevent opportunistic behavior but basically
- 18 they would either have the music written and
- 19 they would control the copyrights directly or 20
- they would have a contract whereby they were 21 able to sell or license the music together,
- 22 both the sound recording and the musical work,

to affect the price? 1

- Absolutely. A
- Q In what way?
- The availability of these substitutes makes the sound recording of the established recognized group much less important to the movie producer and the movie producer can in that case say to the owner of
- 9 the copyright, "I don't really need your 10 particular sound recording. I have an
- 11 alternative. I'm not going to pay based on 12 the popularity of your group."
- 13 You also mentioned, Dr. Pelcovits, 14 that you had some basic theoretical issues 15 with Dr. Jaffe's approach. Do you recall 16 that?
 - \mathbf{A} Yes.
 - Q And just what is the most significant in your view theoretical issues here?
 - Yes, my most significant criticism of what he's done is with essentially the

Page 56 Page 54 and they were able to sell that directly in 1 A I have. 2 2 And just generally can you the market. Q 3 describe what approach that definition of 3 And are you --Q 4 MR. STEINTHAL: I'm going to move 4 revenue takes? 5 5 to strike that last answer as being well Yes, it tries to capture the major 6 sources of revenues of the music services that 6 beyond the scope of his statement and one for 7 which he has no foundation whatsoever. 7 use the sound recordings either through 8 8 MR. HANDZO: Actually I was just subscription or through other direct charges 9 going to ask him whether he's aware of 9 as well as trying to give definitions of the 10 situations in the market where precisely that 10 different ways in which advertising revenue 11 has happened. 11 might be collected from the service. 12 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: I'll let you 12 And this approach of sort of 13 ask. 13 giving specific definitions of what revenue 14 BY MR. HANDZO: 14 would be captured as part of the definition 15 Dr. Pelcovits, are you aware of 15 revenue, is that consistent with what you've 16 situations in the market where what you've 16 seen in marketplace agreements? 17 just described happened, that is, that the 17 It's consistent with what I've 18 owners of the sound recordings acquired the 18 seen and in particular the interactive 19 19 musical works so that they could sell a agreements that I've read in preparing my 20 20 package? initial testimony. 21 21 Okay, and just to be clear when I am aware that that's happening. 22 22 For example, the ring tone markets where the you refer to the interactive agreements, do Page 55 Page 57 1 sound recording, the record labels have 1 you mean they have precisely the definition of 2 2 secured these rights from the publishers so revenue here or do you mean that they just 3 3 they could offer a complete set of rights and sort of generally take the approach of trying 4 4 ability to use the music to the ring tone to be specific about what's in and what's out? 5 5 providers. MR. STEINTHAL: Objection. 6 6 MR. STEINTHAL: I'm going to press Leading. 7 the foundation objection. This is a witness 7 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Overruled. 8 in his deposition --8 THE WITNESS: I would say that 9 9 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Before they similar in the sense of trying to be 10 hearing voir dire, we had ruled on the 10 specific. There are different sources of 11 foundation objection. 11 revenues generally in the two markets. So 12 MR. STEINTHAL: Sorry. 12 it's not the same specific definition, but 13 13 rather the same approach. MR. HANDZO: That completes my question on that subject. 14 14 BY MR. HANDZO: 15 15 And what is the advantage of CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Objection 16 16 taking an approach where you're trying to be sustained. 17 17 specific about what's captured and what's not? BY MR. HANDZO: 18 18 Dr. Pelcovits, let me take you to The advantage is that it helps 19 the last subject in your testimony on the 19 remove uncertainty and future disputes about 20 definition of revenue. Have you reviewed 20 the way in which the agreement will be 21 21 Sound Exchange's proposed definition of implemented going forward.

22

Are there disadvantages?

22

revenue?

Page 58

- A Well, the disadvantages are that to the extent that there are either sources of revenue that are hard to define very specifically or for which there might be new sources of revenue in the future if those are not included the seller is going to get less money.
- Q And would you expect that the definition of revenue and percentage of revenue would be negotiated together or be related in a marketplace negotiation?
- A I would expect that they would be considered as a package and therefore would be negotiated together.
- Q And what would be the effect of negotiating a sort of specific and perhaps narrower definition of revenue?
- A Certainly anything that narrows the definition of revenue and would limit the ability to recover revenue from new sources or hard to classify sources would lead everything else being equal to a higher percentage of

1 A Yes.

2

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

Q Why is that?

A That is the best evidence in the market of what this service is valued by consumers.

6 Q Now what about a circumstance 7 where the music service that's part of a 8 larger bundle isn't offered separately in the 9 marketplace? How do you approach that?

A The approach in the Sound Exchange proposal which I believe is a good one is it doesn't try to value it directly or try to unbundle the bundle in some way. Rather it relies on the different part of the rate structure, namely the per play rate to come up with the fee for the use of the music in a bundle service.

Q And under Sound Exchange's proposal, is it just the flat per play rate?

A It is a per play rate, but it is not the same per play rate that is a part of the three part structure where indeed it is

Page 59

revenue.

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Q Now in your testimony, you addressed in particular the issue of bundled services and what are the issues that arise with respect to bundled services?

A The basic issue with respect to bundled services is it's very difficult to quantify the value to consumers of any piece of the bundle.

Q And what approach does Sound Exchange's proposal make with respect to valuing the music services included as part of a bundle of services?

A With respect to a bundle that includes a music service where that music service is also available on an alla carte basis, namely sold by itself, it uses the price in the alla carte offering as the essentially imputed price for the bundled offering.

Q And is that a reasonable approach in your opinion?

Page 6

possible to measure the revenue directly coming from the subscription to the music.

Q You said it's not the same per play rate. What's the difference?

A The per play rate is increased by 25 percent from the recommended per play rate in the three part structure.

I believe it is and in my opinion

Q And is that a reasonable approach in your view?

it's reasonable because you're giving up

something when you no longer have the revenue part of the rate structure, keeping in mind that the proposed rate structure is a greater than rate structure. In my opinion if you are losing one of the legs of that structure and losing the opportunity to get more revenue if

17 losing the opportunity to get more revenue it 18 in fact the music is valued more and more by

19 consumers, I believe it would be appropriate

20 to take the per play rate from the three part

21 structure and increase it somewhat to handle

22 this very tricky case of bundled services.

Page 61

Page 64 Page 62 Q And are you aware of instances frankly just don't remember what we proposed 1 2 where that sort of approach has actually been for the dates of closing argument. 3 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: The same day, adopted in the marketplace? 4 A I am. 4 the 21st. 5 Q What is that? 5 MR. HANDZO: The 21st. 6 6 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: We didn't There is an agreement between Sony 7 7 BMG and Yahoo for customized radio where they change that. We just moved the others up a too have to deal with this issue of bundled 8 little bit to give us some time to benefit 9 9 services and in terms of the handling of the from what you file. 10 10 bundled service fees, they took this precise MR. HANDZO: Thank you. 11 approach which was to use the per play rate 11 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: So initial 12 12, response 15 and argument 21. Mr. that was part of a rate structure, a two-part 12 13 rate structure, where it was not a bundled 13 Steinthal. 14 service and take the per play rate and 14 MR. STEINTHAL: Thank you. I'm 15 surcharge where it was going to be the only 15 going to leave the issue of the NPD study 16 element in the rate structure. 16 largely to what we say my learned friend 17 MR. HANDZO: Thank you. I believe 17 learned last week. So you refer to the other 18 that's all I have, Your Honor. 18 lawyers in the case as your learned friends. 19 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Let's go 19 CROSS EXAMINATION 20 ahead and take an early morning recess for ten 20 BY MR. STEINTHAL: 21 minutes and then we'll begin with cross 21 Dr. Pelcovits, just to start, I 22 examination. Off the record. 22 just want to be clear. The benchmark services

Page 63

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

(Whereupon, at 10:36 a.m., the above-entitled matter recessed and reconvened at 10:49 a.m.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the record. Mr. Steinthal. On that break, we were able to review the proposals on the schedule and we'll get you an order out hopefully tomorrow, but we're concerned about the proposal to the extend that it would leave us only one day to have the findings and responses before the closing argument, one day given the ways that we get pleadings and so we wouldn't see it more than one day in preparation for the closing arguments.

We'd like to have your findings on December 12, a Tuesday, and then we need your responses by December 15, a Friday, and that will give us at least two days to consider what you filed before your closing arguments and allow us to be more able to respond or to receive the closing arguments.

MR. HANDZO: And, Your Honor, I

1 that you refer to as interactive webcasters

are really conditional download on-demand screaming services, are they not?

I'd have to go back and try to refresh my memory, but I think for the most part they are. They certainly are on-demand and I think for the most part they do allow for conditional downloading.

You do remember that you're relying on the Napster agreements, the Music Net agreements, the services that gave you the conditional downloads and on-demand streaming. Right?

I absolutely remember that. I do not recall whether they all allow for conditional downloads or do not. I don't recall.

You're not using as benchmark agreements the customized radio services that labels feel are interactive. Right?

No, I'm not trying to --Hopefully, let's try to make sure I'm not

Page 65

Page 66

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

21

22

trying to mess, to confuse things. My only,
 I was relying on those services that you just
 mentioned such as Napster and Rhapsody, Yahoo
 Music, that stream music on demand and I do
 not recall whether all of them allow for
 conditional downloading or not. That's the
 only --

Q But Yahoo Music in that sentence, you meant Yahoo Music Unlimited, the conditional download on-demand streaming service that powers by Music Net. Right?

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

l 19

20

21

A Yes, I'm excluding, just again to make sure that we have our categories set, I'm excluding the services that allow conditional downloads to portal devices. Those were not in my benchmark analysis.

Q Okay. In other words, the same services that provide for conditional downloads that also sell portability, you didn't look at the portability aspect of those services.

A I did not use -- I did look at

significantly greater compensation than the musical work." Do you see that?

A Yes.

Q First of all, let's put aside interactive webcasting which I know you studied because you testified about it the first time around. In reality as of the date of your deposition which was October 31st of this year, you had done no independent analysis of the ring tones market. Correct?

A I think it's correct to say that the fees that are recorded here are not something that I did independently.

Q You just took them from Mr. Eisenberg's statement.

A Correct, but I just wanted to make clear it's not as if I had no understanding of this market ahead of time.

Q But isn't it true that you didn't know what the legal status of the rights were as between the mechanical rights and the performing rights associated with ring tone?

Page 67

them, but I did not use those as the basis for my benchmark.

Q I just wanted to be clear because you were using the phrase, "interactive webcasting" this morning rather generally. I just wanted everybody to be focused on the fact that we're not talking about what the labels may view as interactive webcasting from a customized radio service. Your benchmark was the on-demand streaming conditional download services.

A Yes, I have no problem with that characterization at all.

Q Okay.

A I don't think we have any disagreement on that.

Q Now let's -- If you take your report out, the rebuttal report, on page four where you focus us all on your chart, you have the lead-up where you say "and virtually every market where broad or blanket licenses are at issue, the sound recording commands

Page 69

A I said that I was not certain that
what the, in this case, figure given for the
musical works fee, what particular right that
pertained to and that my understanding was
limited to the extent that this is what had to
be paid in order to be able to use the musical
work.

Q Just to be clear, isn't it true that you had conducted no independent investigation of the nature of the licenses in the ring tone market at the time you did your written testimony?

A That's correct.

14 Q And wouldn't the same be true with 15 respect to the music video market that you 16 summarized on this chart?

A Yes.

18 Q And wouldn't the same be true of 19 the clip sample market with respect to this 20 chart?

A Yes.

Q And wouldn't the same be true of

Page 72 Page 70 Take a look if you will. These the digital download market? 1 1 2 2 are -- I think we all have the menu script. Yes. 3 So this would be page 34 which is the upper 3 O Now is it correct that you either understand or observed it to be the case that 4 left-hand quadrant on pages 34 through 37. 4 5 Starting on line 13 on the subject of the 5 the licensees in these markets that you broader blanket licenses you were asked "And 6 6 summarized on page four require a broad or blanket repertoire license to have any 7 what kind of general observation have you made 7 8 to draw that conclusion?" 8 offering that is compelling in the 9 9 marketplace? \mathbf{A} I'm sorry. What page are we on? 10 10 It's on page 34. It's the upper I think it's important that they left-hand quadrant of pages 34 through 37. 11 have a broader blanket license where broad is 11 12 12 seen, I want to make sure we understand the \mathbf{A} Oh, pages. 13 term "broad" as I use it, means that they're 13 Q The page number exists on the bottom right-hand corner of each quadrant. 14 not buying one or two or a small handful of 15 On the bottom. 15 recordings or musical works. They're buying A 16 a large group in order to be able to have a 16 Q Very hard to find sometimes. 17 17 substantial offering to the customer. Thank you. 18 You would agree, wouldn't you, 18 (Off the record comments.) 19 19 that a major hole in the repertoire of sound MR. STEINTHAL: That's a problem. recordings available on any of the services of 20 Anybody have one with page numbers? 20 21 the nature you summarize on page four would it 21 MR. SMITH: They are only missing 22 22 make it difficult for that licensee to offer the bottom. Page 71 Page 73 1 a competitive product in the market? 1 MR. STEINTHAL: Okay. 2 Not necessarily. I would not 2 BY MR. STEINTHAL: 3 3 agree with that. So you're looking then for the one with pages 34 and 36 in the middle of the page 4 Would you agree that there would 4 5 be a significant disadvantage to the licensee 5 and the question was "And what kind of general 6 6 in any of the markets that you summarized on observation have you made to draw that 7 conclusion?" Answer: "I've looked at a lot page four if they didn't have a broad catalog 7 8 including the repertoires of each of the four 8 of the major websites and looked through their 9 9 majors? catalogs and their advertising and they all, 10 A I would not agree with that. 10 the major ones, seem to have very, very broad 11 MR. STEINTHAL: Let me ask you to 11 catalogs and seem to promote the fact that 12 take a look at your deposition. This would be 12 they have very large catalogs and it seems to Services Rebuttal Exhibit 25. 13 13 be an important competitive variable so that 14 (Whereupon, the document 14 if one of them did not have a very broad referred to was marked 15 catalog and the other one did it would seem to 15 16 as Services Rebuttal 16 be a significant disadvantage." Do you agree 17 Exhibit No. 25 for 17 with that testimony? identification.) 18 18 A Yes. 19 BY MR. STEINTHAL: 19 So at some point, there's a

20

21

22

significant competitive disadvantage to a service that's offering any of the products

that you summarize on page four if they don't

20

21

22

You recall your deposition was

taken on October 31st.

I do.

A

Page 74

have certain repertoire.

A No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

O Then how do you square what you said in your deposition with that answer?

Because the question in my deposition is with respect to digital downloads and you asked me whether the need for a broad catalog was true with respect to any of these and it's not true with respect to some of them.

Okay. So it is true as to digital O downloads.

I believe it is true that you need a broad set of licenses, yes.

And with respect to interactive webcasting or interactive services, I think we already talked about that and you would say it is important. Right?

A I would agree with that.

And with respect to ring tone, wouldn't you agree that it would be a rather bad consumer experience if I went to a website

1 titles that they offer at any point in time.

> 2 It's nothing like the interactive webcasting

3 or the digital downloads where there would be 4 sometimes two million or so titles. They just

5 don't do that with respect to the ring tones.

6 It's also true that there have been ring tone 7 providers that have not had the music catalogs 8

of all four major record labels in the market.

9 Let me ask you to take a look at 10 pages 32 to 33 of your deposition. Again, 11 I'll wait until people find the page 30 in the middle of the page. We're talking about the 12 13 top right quadrant of pages 30, 31, 32 and 33

14 and on line 19 of page 32 you were asked "What

15 do you base your statement that in the master

ring tones market services need a broad or 16

17 blanket license?" Answer: "That's why I

18 didn't use the term 'need.' My understanding

19 is that there are very broad licenses but I

20 don't know for sure whether that is a

21 development that might have in fact gone a

different way." Is that testimony still true? 22

Page 75

and I wanted Beyonce as my ring tone or I wanted the Rolling Stones as my ring tone and when I asked for it I didn't get it?\

Not necessarily, no.

Q Why would I go back to that service if I were a customer if every time I went there or on a number of occasions I went there and I wasn't getting the music that I was seeking to buy?

A It's not at all the case that I would expect that consumers when they're looking for ring tones have a powerful demand for a particular piece of music and would not accept a second best or a third best substitute.

Now of course, you haven't studied Q this market independently. You're just making that assumption at this point.

I have looked at the market. I have seen first of all that ring tone providers do not provide full catalogs of music. There is usually a limited number of Page 77

1 Well, I have learned something 2 about the ring tone market since the 3 deposition. So I do know more about how the 4 market went in a particular case, but other 5 than that, what I said there is -- I would 6 stand by that.

7 And then when you were asked 8 specifically as to the ring tone market on 9 line 9 of page 33, just skipping down to the 10 bottom right-hand quadrant, "Have you 11 conducted any independent investigation of the 12 nature of the licenses in that market?" You 13 answered "No." Correct?

\mathbf{A} That's correct.

But since then you have had more conversations with Mr. Eisenberg.

\mathbf{A} I have.

14

15

16

17

21

22

18 And clip licenses are generally 19 designed to promote sales of digital 20 downloads, are they not?

Either digital downloads or sales of CDs, yes.

Page 78

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

So you would agree that as to clip samples you would have to have a very broad catalog in order to have a viable service.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

Yes, I would agree with that.

Now it's true, is it not, that with respect to all of the markets that are summarized on page 4 of your rebuttal testimony, the catalogs of each majors are not substitutes for one another? Are they?

I believe that's correct with respect to all the places other than ring tones. I think there is a degree of substitutability that's greater in the ring tone market.

0 And that degree of substitutability that you just talked about with respect to ring tones is based on your assumption that you can get by without a broad catalog in a ring tones market?

It's based on more than an assumption. It's based on both looking at the services and seeing that they don't provide a

mean for some of their titles, no, I'm not aware of that.

So when you gave your testimony, you talked about there generally being a broad catalog of rights being available for all of the services that listed on page 4. You included the fact that each one of those kinds of services typically has a license from all the major license companies. Correct?

Yes, I think that is correct in the market that they typically do have those licenses from all four majors.

Now would you agree with the proposition that in light of the characteristics of the markets that you've discussed in your testimony the sound recording owner has substantial market power relative to the licensee?

If by "market power" we mean the ability to have price set above marginal cost, I would agree that there are independent demands for independent copyrighted works and

Page 79

million different offerings and understanding that from an analysis of what I would expect consumers to be doing in this market is that they would be more willing to accept or to use a substitute piece of music for their ring tone and, thirdly, based on what I learned in my discussions with Mr. Eisenberg that a ring tone provider did not reach an agreement in one case with Sony BMG but yet was still offering service in the marketplace.

Now it's true, is it not, that in ring tones you don't see repertoire of a million or two million songs? You testified to that. Right?

Yes. A

And other than your conversation 0 with Mr. Eisenberg with whom we can talk directly, so I think we should do that on Thursday, are you aware of any major ring tone provider that is operating without a license from each of the majors?

If by "license to the majors" you

they are not close substitutes one for the

2 other whether it be from one song to another 3 or for one group of songs to another. 4

And that's akin to the market power that you talked about that exists in the interactive webcasting market that you testified about the first time around?

MR. HANDZO: I would object to making him try and recall whatever he said how ever many months ago it was.

MR. STEINTHAL: That's all right. We can just go back to that testimony later. We do have to do that now.

> THE WITNESS: That's fine. BY MR. STEINTHAL:

Now let's shift to the music 16 publisher side of the equation with each one 17 18 of the kinds of services that are listed on

19 your chart on page 4. Isn't it true that

20 music publishers in each one of the examples

21 on your chart on page 4 must license on a 22

basis such that their ability to take

Page 81

advantage of whatever market power they have is constrained by a statutory license or antitrust consent decree that effectively limits their royalties to reasonable competitive market levels?

A Not necessarily.

Q Let's take them one by one. Okay? Interactive webcasting. Now music publishers in terms of the licensing of the performance rights and musical works to entities that are engaged in interactive webcasting are subject to the constraints of the ASCAP and BMI Consent Decree Courts, are they not?

A I don't know how the parties view that in terms of interactive webcasting. I do know that regardless of the consent decree that this fee is still under negotiation. So it's hard to say that the fee itself is determined by the rate court or by the consent degree.

Q I didn't hear you. "It's hard to say that the fee itself..."

Page 84

1 the word "tainted." I was saying that there

2 is a constraint. There is the fact that the

3 providers of the service of customized radio

4 can by modifying their service somewhat offer5 something that's compliant with the statutory

6 service and that would limit its value to see 7 it as a separate independent marketplace pi

it as a separate independent marketplace piece of evidence.

9 Q Wasn't your testimony as well that
10 prior voluntary agreement between the RIAA and
11 Sound Exchange on the one hand and the DiMA
12 companies on the other couldn't be used as a
13 benchmark either because it was tainted by the
14 fact that there was — it was negotiated in
15 the backdrop of a compulsory license?

A Are you talking about the carry forward of the earlier rates?

Q I'm talking about the agreement entered into in 2003 that set rates and terms for webcasting under the statutory license for the period January 1, 2003 through December 31, 2005 and I thought your testimony was you

Page 83

A Is set by the rate court or by the consent degree.

Q Don't you think that the fees that evolve from a marketplace in which absent agreement there is resort to the rate court are fees that will be constrained by the existence of that independent rate setting body?

A They might. They might not.

Q Isn't that the gist of your testimony in rejecting the customized radio deals that they are somehow tainted because of the existence of the statutory license for sound recordings?

A No.

Q So your testimony is not that the voluntary agreements between record companies and customized radio services are tainted in terms of their value as a benchmark because of the existence of the rate setting body that we have under Section 114?

A I was disagreeing with your use of

couldn't look at that as a benchmark in any respect because it was negotiated in the

backdrop, with a backdrop, of a compulsorylicense.

A That is essentially correct.

Q So what I'm having trouble with why when you're analyzing this for the sound recording owners there's this taint but you seem to be distinguishing between the outcome of negotiations with the backdrop of this Board and as opposed to the backdrop of a consent decree rate court setting. Are you distinguishing between the two?

A I'm distinguishing between the case where the rates are set explicitly by the court in the case of webcasting which is a close substitute for customized radio. In the case here of the musical work fee for interactive webcasting, there is no set rate for this use of musical works. This is still being negotiated.

Q You have something in your chart,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

don't you?

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

4

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

A No, I think what I was saying is there was no rate set by a court.

We have musical work fee that you put in your chart at six to sixteen percent, right, for interactive webcasting?

A Yes.

0 Now my question is aren't those figures constrained by the existence of an ASCAP and BMI Rate Court to which users can go if they perceive that ASCAP and BMI are seeking supra competitive fees.

It might be. It might not be constrained. It depends on where the market would end up in the absence of the rate court and what I've said is there's still evidence here in the market where there is no rate actually set and determined by the rate court.

19 I'm not really understanding 20 because I'm not sure whether your testimony is that there has to be a rate set for the 21 22 consent decree court to have this effect

Page 88 Okay. Do you believe that is a rate that has been artificially constrained by the existence of a statutory license?

Again, I'm not certain.

But you know it's the outcome of a proceeding and ultimately a rate setting under the Section 115 compulsory license. Right?

Yes.

And that didn't stop you from using a musical work rate that has been the subject of oversight via a CRB or rate court setting even though whenever it comes to a sound recording rate that's the subject of a voluntary agreement and the backdrop of a compulsory license you don't want to look at that at all. Right?

MR. HANDZO: I object to the characterization of his testimony. That was a speech not a question.

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Overruled. THE WITNESS: I think it is important to distinguish what I'm doing in

constraining price or whether it's mere 2 existence as a place to go act as the 3 constraint on price. Which is it?

A rate set by a court is a certain constraint and depending on what we're looking at as far as other markets and what would happen in those other markets because of the existence of a set rate by a court such as the case of the customized radio would be one thing. The possibility of going to a rate court could constrain. It might not constrain. It depends on where the market will end up or would end up absent the rate court.

And it's okay for you when you construct your chart on page 4 to look at rates that have been constrained by a compulsory license on the musical works side, for example, the 9.1 cents per track. That's a compulsory license rate for digital downloads, is it not?

Yes. A

Page 87

Page 89 this table from the concern I have about using customized radio as a benchmark in this case.

BY MR. STEINTHAL:

O Let's take customized radio out of the equation. Let's focus on the voluntary agreement reached between DiMA and the RIAA and Sound Exchange in 2003. You threw that out as well, didn't you?

T ---A

10 Q Yes or no?

11 No, I don't think yes or no where I didn't say I threw it out. I did not rely 12 13 on it. I do not think it's a good benchmark 14 and --

Q And yet you had no compunction about -- I'm sorry.

No, no. And I think there were a number of factors that went into that specifically that this was seen as a temporary agreement which was a carry-forward in order to take the industry through to the next rate proceeding.

Page 90

And don't you know as a matter of fact, Dr. Pelcovits, that the 9.1 cents per track for digital downloads musical work rate and the 10 percent musical work fee for master ring tones for musical works are being challenged by the publishers who believe they're entitled to more than that?

I don't know about that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

0 But you didn't do any investigation and you just listed them on your column to show relative values between sound recording fees and musical work fees even though all of the rates under the musical work fee column are rates that are either set by a rate court or a mechanical license compulsory license or negotiated with a backdrop of a rate court or a compulsory license? Isn't that right?

MR. HANDZO: Objection. That assumes facts not known. He hasn't established any of that.

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Overruled.

1 -- and I think it's very important to see here

- 2 that the issue here is the relationship
- 3 between the sound recording fee and the
- 4 musical work fee and I'm not saying that you
- 5 should set the fee in this case based on this
- 6 relationship. I am simply saying that Dr.
- 7 Jaffe has ignored all of these other markets
- 8 where certainly the legal and other situations
- 9 are very different, but yet you see the

10 persistence of the sound recording fee being 11 significantly greater than the musical work

12 fee.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

8

15

16

17

18

19

20

BY MR. STEINTHAL:

I don't think you answered my question. So we're going to go through one by one and I would submit to you that Dr. Jaffe explained why he found those other markets not being persuasive, but we will go back to that testimony and focus on yours today.

Let's -- Again I had asked you whether each of these musical work fees on your chart on page 4 are constrained by the

Page 91

He asked him to ask him that question that you've just said that it's not been established.

MR. HANDZO: Yes, he has asked the question and he didn't get an answer that now establishes the factual predicate of his question. That's my concern.

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: And I think that's part of the question.

MR. HANDZO: Okay.

THE WITNESS: With respect to some of these there are rates established under statutes such as digital downloads, with respect to, for example, master ring tones where the rates, and in particular, this ten percent rate, was negotiated before any determination was made by any court or by this court. So there are cases here where there are influences of a court or a regulatory decree but these are what prevails in the marketplace and have prevailed consistently

for these types of musical works and I'm also

Page 93

- existence of a compulsory license or the 1
- 2 ASCAP/BMI Rate court. Let's take it one by
- 3 one. First of all, the interactive
- 4 webcasting, you would agree with me, right,
- 5 that the streams made by interactive
- 6 webcasting services are public performances of
- 7 the musical works?

A Yes.

9 And any licensee of ASCAP and BMI 10 that objects to the fees being sought by ASCAP and BMI has a right to secure a rate setting 11 12 of what is a reasonable fee under the ASCAP 13 and BMI Consent Degree Courts. Correct? 14

It has a right to go to the court. Exactly what would happen, it's hard to say.

And it's true, is it not, that the charter of the rate court is to set a fee that is reasonable which has been construed by the ASCAP and BMI Rate Courts as setting a competitive market fee? Do you remember that?

21 I don't recall. I don't recall 22 that specifically.

Page 94

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

22

All right. So you're with me that there is such a constraint on the interactive webcasting fees. Let's go to master ring tones. You're familiar, are you not, with the fact that there is a compulsory license under Section 115 of the Copyright Law governing musical work reproductions made in the delivery of ring tones?

A Yes.

1

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

120

Are you familiar with the fact that publishers challenged that because they wanted the ability to charge more than they could get under the mechanical compulsory license?

A I am aware that there has been an issue and it was recently ruled on by this Court.

It was the Copyright Office that Q ruled, did it not, that the mechanical license does cover ring tones?

That's my understanding of the decision, yes.

knowing that an economic actor challenged 1

2 whether or not it was subject to a compulsory

3 license, that the reason for doing so as a

4 matter of economics was to avoid being subject 5 to pricing constraint.

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Objection sustained. Your explanation is not the question you asked.

MR. STEINTHAL: Well, let me ask it again then.

BY MR. STEINTHAL:

Can you infer from the fact that the publishers challenged whether or not the reproductions made in ring tones were subject to a compulsory license, that they preferred not be to subject to that compulsory license when it comes to the pricing of rates and master incomes?

A I think it's a reasonable inference, but I don't know enough of the details of what they have done in the courts to say for sure what they think is going to

Page 95

And you understand as you sit here today that the publishers are upset with that because it constrains their pricing ability with respect to mechanical rights and ring tones?

I don't know if I can say what I think they've done and what their views on this are.

Well, could you infer from the fact that they challenged that ring tones should be covered by the compulsory license that they preferred so that they would have greater pricing flexibility to not be covered by the compulsory license?

MR. HANDZO: I object to asking him speculate about what one could read into the minds of people who decided to bring litigation.

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Steinthal.

MR. STEINTHAL: I'm asking him to 22 make an inference as an economist based on

Page 97 happen and what they think they would be able to get in the market absent that compulsory

3 license.

> Now the master ring tones Q percentage that you have under the musical work fee, is it correct, sir, that that is just for the reproduction right and doesn't include any public performance right?

That is what was agreed to and paid for the ability to use the musical works back before this issue was resolved.

Well, is it not the case that the agreements to which you refer if you're familiar with them from speaking with Mr. Eisenberg in fact cover only the mechanical reproduction right and leave out the question of fees for the public performances associated with ring tones if it is ultimately determined that there is a licensable public performance in the delivery of a ring tone?

21 That's not my recollection.

> Excuse me? Q

Page 98 Page 100 That is not what I recall. 1 number on the bottom right-hand corner, REB A 2 003948. I'll represent to you this is a 0 And as you sit here today, you 3 document that was produced by Sound Exchange just don't know one way or the other? in the rebuttal phase discovery. I'm going to I don't know one way or another. 4 5 ask you to read to yourself paragraph 5.04 Q Are you aware that the public 6 and, Mr. Handzo, I'd like to read just a performance organizations, ASCAP and BMI, have 7 portion of the paragraph that relates to whose sought public performance licenses for the 8 responsibility it is to clear composition delivery of music in ring tones? I believe that to be correct, yes. 9 performance rights. I don't think that would 10 well to be deemed to be confidential but I Do you know what the resolution of 11 leave to you whether you want to put it on a that is in any respect? 12 restrictive record. That that potentially decided in 13 MR. HANDZO: Well, first of all, I that Librarian's decision but I don't recall exactly how the ruling came out. I am looking 14 have a more general objection which is an at what is negotiated in the market. 15 objection to examining the witness about a And as you sit here today, you 16 document that he hasn't seen before. 17 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. don't know whether that figure, and I want to keep it on the public record, so I won't say 18 Steinthal. what it is, associated with master ring tones 19 MR. STEINTHAL: He's given includes or does not include public 20 testimony about his understanding from talking performance rights. Correct? 21 to Mr. Eisenberg that the public performance 22 rights associated with ring tones were in fact I understand in my belief based on Page 101 Page 99 what Mr. Eisenberg has in his testimony is 1 included in the chart that he presented on 2 that is what is paid. That is what the music page 4. I'm asking him to take a look at 3 ring tone companies are paying to be able to paragraph 5.04 and ultimately will ask him use a musical works in their ring tones. 4 whether looking at this makes him confident in 5 his testimony or not as to who or whether the MR. STEINTHAL: Let's mark this as 6 public performance right and the composition Services Exhibit R-26 an agreement between Mr. 7 is covered under the typical label ring tone Eisenberg's company, Sony BMG, and Verizon 8 provider agreement. 9 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Handzo. 10 MR. HANDZO: I don't think that solves the problem and in addition to the 11 extent that Mr. Steinthal is holding this out 12

13

14

with respect to ring tones and see if we can shed some light on this. Your Honor, this agreement has been marked as restricted as produced by Sony BMG. I will try to ask the questions in a fashion so as not to have us go off into restricted session, but I'm sure that Mr. Handzo will remind if we go astray. BY MR. STEINTHAL:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

Is this one of the agreements, Services Rebuttal Exhibit R-26, that you received from Mr. Eisenberg for your review?

 \mathbf{A} I did not review this. I can't tell you that.

MR. STEINTHAL: Let me ask you to turn to page SX REB, this is the Bates stamped as typical there is certainly no foundation for that either. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: The objection

15 is overruled. 16

17 MR. HANDZO: Just to complete the 18 record, can I just have again which part 19 you're referring to?

20 MR. STEINTHAL: It's paragraph 21 5.04, the "In addition" sentence. 22

MR. HANDZO: Okay. I'm not going

Page 102

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

Page 103

to invoke the objection with respect to that.

BY MR. STEINTHAL:

3

5

7

8

9

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19 20

21

22

First of all, the use of the phrase, "digital downloads" in the context of this ring tone agreement, Dr. Pelcovits, if 6 you look at page 5, it's a very long definition, but it is meant to include the ring tone itself. I'll represent that to you and then what I'm asking you to focus on is in

10 paragraph 5.04 where the sentence is "In 11 addition in the event that the delivery or

other use of digital downloads as authorized 12

13 under this agreement constitutes a public

14 performance of any composition embodied there

15 in, Company agrees, represents and warrants

16 that it will be responsible for obtaining and

17 paying for such performance licenses with respect to such compositions, i.e., to ASCAP, 18

19 BMI and SESAC. The parties acknowledge that

20 the foregoing requirement does not express or

21 imply any agreement by the parties that

22 performance licenses are necessary for such 1 with the delivery of ring tones.

> No, this is one agreement. I'm not sure what it is.

Q Okay.

And my statement was based on my understanding of Mr. Eisenberg's testimony.

Okay. We will deal with Mr. Eisenberg on that. Do you recall testifying at your deposition that with respect to the musical works part of ring tones you did not recall specifically what the different rights were that were implicated?

> A Yes.

0 All right. So we've gone down the first two on page 4. Now the next of the markets that you referred to there is the digital download piece and I'm going to ask you, I think you've already acknowledged this, but the 9.1 cents per track that you list there is a figure that was set under a compulsory license. Correct?

A Yes.

Page 105

purposes." And my question is whether looking at that clause gives you pause about your testimony that the number in your chart includes public performance rights, if any, associated with ring tones.

MR. HANDZO: Your Honor, I am sorry. Let me just propose an additional objection and that is this entire line of questioning presumes that this is a ring tone agreement. There's no foundation for it and I don't believe that it is.

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Overruled. THE WITNESS: Could I have the question read back please?

15 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. 16 Steinthal.

BY MR. STEINTHAL:

O My question is simply whether looking at that passage gives you any caution about your testimony as to whether the figure in your chart includes whatever public performance rights, if any, are associated

And are you familiar with whether or not music publishers have taken the position that there is a public performance in the delivery of a digital download to which they are entitled to compensation?

A I'm not aware of that.

Q You don't know one way or the other?

A I do not know one way or the other.

And is it correct, however, that this 9.1 cents is just for the mechanical right and to the extent that there's a public performance right associated with the musical work in the delivery of a digital download that's not included in the 9.1?

That would be my understanding, A yes.

Now on music videos there, what are we talking about there in terms of the rights that are implicated first on the sound recording side? What rights do labels license

in music videos?

 $\begin{vmatrix} 20 \\ 21 \end{vmatrix}$

A They certainly license the performance right there. As I think I said in my deposition, I'm not sure whether this also involves any sort of a copying by the music service, but these are the rights that they need in order to be able to provide the services.

Q Is it in fact a right in the sound recording that they license the labels or is it some other copyright right that they have an entitlement to with respect to music videos?

A I don't know the nature of the legal right here. I know that these are the prices that have to be paid to use what the sound recording companies own.

Q Isn't it true, sir, that what is licensed in the context of a music video agreement is the copyright in the audio visual work itself?

A You're asking -- I mean I don't

Page 108

1 A I've not done that. I don't think

A I've not done that. I don't think it can be done.

Q But you didn't even try to do it, did you?

A Like I said, I don't — In terms of trying to take apart something that's sold as an entity, I don't think it can be done. I did not try to do it.

Q Now on the music video side as we shift over to the right-hand column for musical works, again with respect to exploitation of music videos that are streamed, those would be public performances subject to the constraints of the ASCAP and BMI Rate Courts. Is that a fair statement?

A I would agree with you that those are performances. The nature of the constraint as I said earlier I'm not sure how binding it is and how influential it is on the prices paid.

Q And the 5.1 to 6.5 percent, what does that cover? Is that for the music

Page 107

know the answer to the legal definition of what right is being licensed here.

Q Hypothetically, if you don't know one way or the other, if what's being licensed is a right in an audio visual work in which the visual creation and right is copyrighted and has distinct value, don't you think that looking at the full price for the integrated work overstates the value of the sound recording itself?

A I think the only information that we can take from this market is that this is a work, a copyrighted work, by the sound recording company which includes music and audio, I'm sorry, includes music and video and this is the price paid for it. It is what it is.

Q And you have done no analysis to try to discern how much of the value is associated with the video or the audio visual copyright as distinguished from the value of the sound recording itself. Correct? Page 109

performance rights in the musical works?

A That's my understanding. As I indicate in the footnote, there are additional payments for synch rights that have not yet been set.

Q It's not just synch rights, is it, Dr. Pelcovits? There is server copy that needs to be made to deliver the music video and that involves a reproduction of a musical work, does it not?

A I have -- I do not know what the status is of that.

Q Well, that server copy is different than the synch right, isn't it?

A I don't know how that's handled legally.

Q So in your analysis of this market, you didn't even discern whether there were one or two different reproduction rights associated with delivery of music videos on the musical work side that are not captured in the 5.1 to 6.5 percent entry on your chart.

Page 110

2

3

4

5

6

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

15

16

17

18

19 20

Isn't that a correct statement?

A I have relied on Mr. Eisenberg's testimony and it says what it says and I refer to it in my testimony.

Q Are you familiar with the fact that there have been infringement lawsuits brought by music publishers against companies that have not gotten server copies associated with the delivery of music services?

A No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Q Now even familiar with the fact that Universal Music Group was one of them in the Farm Club litigation where they were sued by music publishers for failing to get server copies?

A No.

Q You didn't consider any of that in your analysis. Correct?

A I did not have any knowledge of that when I put my testimony together. That's correct. As I said, I'm relying on the assistance of these fee levels based on Mr. 1 reasonable rates. Correct?

A Yes.

Q Now is it a fair statement that you criticized Dr. Jaffe for not having done an analysis of these markets?

A Yes.

Q And you have no hesitation having sessentially done no analysis other than looking at Mr. Eisenberg's statement testifying that it was inappropriate for Dr. Jaffe to not look at these markets?

A I have no hesitation at all. If you have — I'll explain my answer. If you have many markets where both rights are provided he looked at one of them. The industries, musical works and sound recordings, are very different. The costs are different. The level of revenues collected by the two industries are very different and in fact, overall the sound recording industry has revenues many times higher than the musical works industry. There's a persistence of this

Page 111

Eisenberg's testimony.

Q Just to finish the chart, clip samples, would you agree with me that the streaming of clip samples invokes a public performance right in the musical work?

A I don't know the legal status.

Q The 5.1 percent figure there, do you know whether that's just a performance right or whether it includes any related reproduction rights or server rights?

A I don't know what it includes.

Q Would you agree that at least the public performance piece is subject to ASCAP and BMI Rate Court rate setting mechanisms in the event the licensee and ASCAP and BMI can't reach an agreement on an appropriate fee?

A I believe it could be brought to the rate court. That's not saying that the rate court either has set a rate or what people's expectations of that would be.

Q The rate court has set rates in different media which it has determined to be

Page 113

fact that sound recordings receive much moremoney than musical works and I think that Dr.

3 Jaffe erred by ignoring that entire trend in

4 the market and just selecting one single

5 example where they on average were receiving

6 the same fee. In spite of all of the

7 institutional details that we've talked about

8 here, there is this persistence in the market

9 and the market goes on and continues with

10 these types of fees present and with these

11 types of relative revenues present and I think

that, yes, regardless of what exact rights exist in any particular use of the music th

exist in any particular use of the music that
is the persistent fact in the market and

is the persistent fact in the market and that's what he should have looked at.

Q And you're not referring to any markets other than the ones on your chart though. Just to be clear, there are the ones you're referring to that tell us more in your economic judgment than the master use synch

21 rights market. Correct? Yes or no?
22 A No. I think that he has to look

×

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

at the industry as a whole and I'm sure he has 1 2 as I have and if you look at this industry 3 regardless of looking at any individual market you will see that the relationship between the 5 revenues collected by the record companies 6 versus the music publishers is only identical 7 in this synch market and it is exceptional 8 relative to the overall level of revenues in 9 the market, the overall level of costs in the 10 markets and these particular examples where 11 both rights have been provided.

I'm going to come back and we're going to talk about why in a few minutes. Okay? My question was whether there are any other aspects of the market where you did a comparison of the compensation between the sound recording owners on the one side and the musical work owners on the other, other than the ones that are shown on your chart on page 4.

And I would say yes, but it is also very relevant and I have looked at the

Page 116 responsibility of the sound recording company

1 2 to pay out of the royalty that it collects

from its licensee? Is that not the case?

That is true in some of the cases.

Q It's true with respect to ring tones, is it not?

As far as -- It is certainly true with respect to some of the ring tone agreements. I don't know if that's true with respect to all of the agreements.

And it's true with respect to digital download sales as well, is it not?

I do not recall that.

Now let's take the ring tone example because you do recognize that there are instances where the publisher royalty comes out of the sound recording royalty. Now when that's the case, your numbers really need to be adjusted to be fair comparisons, don't they, because you would have to deduct out of the sound recording compensation number that

which flows out to the music publishers.

overall level of revenues that are earned by the record companies relative to the music publishers.

Q You mean in the aggregate as an industry.

The aggregate as an industry I A think is very relevant.

Okay. Now in every one of the instances that we've looked at on your chart on page 4 it's true that the sound recording owner is not constrained from using whatever market power it has to extract license fees from licensees. Correct?

I would not view this as an extraction of market power but if it is true that there are no constraints of a legal or other judicial kind of ruling on these particular negotiations.

Just a couple more things on your numbers in your chart on page four. Now there are a couple of cases, are there not, where the publishing royalty is actually the

Right? 1

> If you wanted to get an exact ratio, yes, but it would not change the overall conclusion I draw that the sound recording fee is much higher than the musical work fee.

But to be accurate, wouldn't you Q want to take out from the sound recording compensation part of your chart and put in a number that is net of what the sound recording company has to pay the publisher for the publishing rights?

If you wanted an exact ratio, that's what you would need to do. I agree.

And with respect to music videos, are you aware of the fact that the label is often responsible for the synch rights, the original synchronization right, associated with the creation of the music video?

I do not recall that fact.

21 Have you seen, for example, the 22 Sony agreement with Yahoo on that subject?

Page 117

14 15 16

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

17 18 19

20 21

Page 118 Page 120 1 BY MR. STEINTHAL: Have you seen any music video agreements? I 2 Now at your deposition, actually 2 won't show it to you if you haven't. 3 the question starts at line 22 on page 11 I have not seen that. 3 4 Do you have any idea what the 4 which is the bottom left-hand quadrant. The 5 question was "But as an economic matter, does liability is associated with the costs of 6 securing sink rights to music videos? 6 that fact that a cost may be sunk -- Let me 7 rephrase. Is that a cost may be sunk relevant 7 No. A 8 Q 8 in pricing decisions?" Answer: "It usually But you would agree, would you 9 is." "And what way is it usually relevant?" 9 not, that that too would have to be backed out 10 "Well, sunk costs are not part of marginal 10 to have a fair, accurate rendition of the true 11 costs and at least with respect to the ratio between the musical work and sound 11 particular service or good that we're looking 12 recording compensation rights? 12 13 If there was a payment by the 13 at and most pricing decisions are done on the basis of marginal costs, marginal revenues, so 14 14 sound recording copyright holder to the 15 it doesn't enter into the same way..." I'm 15 musical work provider, yes, that should be sorry. "It doesn't enter it," I guess we're 16 backed out to get an accurate ratio. Correct. 16 17 Now you would agree, would you 17 missing a word, "the same way some costs, I not, that sunk costs -- We'll change the 18 suppose, that that wasn't sunk." When you 18 gave that answer, you didn't say except in the 19 subject a little bit. 19 20 case of intellectual property, did you? 20 A Okav. 21 That's not the nature of the That sunk costs are not part of 22 22 marginal costs. Correct? question. You're asking me to compare answers Page 119 Page 121 I would agree with that. 1 to two different questions. \mathbf{A} 2 And would you agree that as a Now you criticize Dr. Jaffe's 3 matter of economics pricing decisions analysis, do you know, by focusing on a market 4 for sound recordings in which you say the typically are conducted on the basis of 5 musical work is merely an input. Correct? considering marginal costs and marginal 6 revenue? A Yes. 7 I would agree that that is true as Now the fact is that in your A a general matter, but it is -- There's a 8 analysis you don't really distinguish between 9 the broader market for the sale and significant difference in markets for 10 intellectual property. 10 distribution of sound recordings and the narrower market for the performance of sound Take a look if you will at page 11 11 12 of your deposition. Actually, it's page 12. 12 recordings, do you? 13 13 I'm having trouble with the page numbers I do not distinguish with respect 14 myself. 14 to analyzing pricing issues with respect to 15 This is the bottom right-hand 15 this industry. 16 You viewed the broader market for 16 corner now? sale and distribution of sound recordings and 0 Yes. 17 18 the narrow market for the performance of sound JUDGE ROBERTS: It would be the

19

20

21

22

you?

characterization.

recording as being interchangeable, didn't

I don't agree with that

20 21 22

5

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

17

18

19

top right corner.

top right corner of that page.

MR. STEINTHAL: I'm sorry. The

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Let's go back to your deposition 1 2 then and make sure I have the right page with all this. It would be starting on page 15, line 14. This is the bottom left-hand corner 4 5 of the quadrant. The question was asked "Now, 6 Dr. Pelcovits, are we in this proceeding 7 talking about the market for musical works and 8 sound recordings?" Answer: "We're talking 9 about the market for sound recordings." 10 Question: "Are we talking about the market 11 for sound recordings or the market for the 12 performance right and sound recordings?" 13 Answer: "I would say I've used those terms interchangeably. That is I'm using them 14 interchangeably." So you did give the 15 16 testimony in your deposition that you used those terms, the broader market for sale and 17 18 distribution and the narrower market for 19 musical performance rights interchangeably, 20 didn't you?

In the responses to the questions that he asked me in the deposition.

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Page 124 sound recordings on the other and by "sale and 1

2 distribution" I mean for example licensing to

3 brick and mortar record stores, licensing to

4 iTunes for digital download sales, but

5 basically the sale of sound recording through

6 Amazon, brick and mortar stores, etc.

Here what I would say to that that I think there is certainly a difference in the institutional nature of how these transactions take place. There is not a difference in the sense that the underlying economics of the industry is not different from one to the other, that what will overall in a free market drive prices and the returns to the different participants in this market are subject to the same laws of economics. So that's why I emphasize the importance of considering the musical work principally as an input into a market where generally speaking what is being bought and sold by users and consumers are particular pieces of sound recordings where the musical work is an input.

Page 123

And didn't you in doing your analysis in your rebuttal statement do the same thing that you looked at the market broadly as the music market rather than looking at the narrower market for the performance of sound recordings as a separate market?

 \mathbf{A} No, I think that's incorrect. I think if we focused on what we started with a minute ago which is the point I made about musical works being an input into the sound recording that is a statement about the industry in general and how music is created as a general matter. That doesn't mean there are not issues with respect to the way in which licenses are provided and offered in the industry.

Would you or wouldn't you dispute that there are different characteristics as between the market for the sale and distribution of sound recordings on the one hand and the market for the performance of

Page 125 Now just as I heard you say that,

2 you were talking about the purchase and sale 3 or the delivery and sale of music and again

4 isn't it true that you viewed as

interchangeable the sale and distribution of

music as one market and the public performance

7 of music as a separate market? 8

No. I think that what I am saying is interchangeable is that in looking at these markets what is fundamentally going on is the production and the sale of music which includes sound recordings and musical works where musical works properly viewed as an economic model are an input. They are sold. As I said when I'm analyzing a particular subpart of the market, I'm going to want to understand the market as a whole. I'm not isolating pieces of that market and saying look at that. Look at the rights. Look at the facts that there are two rights and ignore the fact that there is a bigger broader market under which this is occurring.

Page 126

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Q You didn't do a separate supply and demand analysis of the sale and distribution market for sound recordings from the musical, I'm sorry, from the performance market for sound recordings. Correct?

1 2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

A I didn't undertake a specific analysis of the market for sale of and distribution of sound recordings through CDs and other purchases. I did look at the market as a whole and tried to understand the economic forces that influence all different parts of the market and in my opinion, that is the way to try to understand fundamentally the way that a market with willing buyers and willing sellers would come to an agreement on the prices for the different components of what is eventually sold in the market.

Q I think my question was capable of a yes or no answer. So the answer is you didn't do a separate analysis, did you?

A I would say, yes, I did an analysis in the sense of reviewing and

Page 128

1 a well-recognized recording for the background

2 to a scene. The musical work is still

embedded in that sound recording, is it not?

A Yes.

Q Is that any different in terms of the musical work being an input into the final product than in respect of the other markets that you looked at?

A Yes.

Q In what respect?

A That the producer of the movie or the TV show would and as we have seen in the market will purchase the musical work right directly and substitute for the sound recording. It will unbundle in some sense those two different pieces of intellectual property.

Q You're changing my hypothetical. My hypothetical is I want a specific sound recording for purposes of a theme or for purposes of the scene. Okay? I don't want just any music. I want Sinatra's performance

Page 127

analyzing and looking at the industry as a whole. Yes.

Q But you didn't do a separate analysis of the supply and demand characteristics of the market for the sale and distribution of sound recordings on the one hand as distinguished from the market for the performance of sound recordings. Correct?

A I did to the extent that that is a feature of the market as whole. If by analysis, you're saying that I undertake an effort to estimate supply and demand and do a full scale analysis, the answer is no, I didn't do that.

Q Now I believe your testimony is that in the market for music generally a musical work is a mere input into the sound recording. Right?

A Yes.

Q Now suppose I want to use a particular sound recording in a TV show or a movie as a theme song that people recognize or

1 or Billy Joel's performance. I don't want

2 some cover band. I want somebody that

3 somebody's heard of before. Okay? In that

4 hypothetical is the musical work any less of

simply being an input your words in theultimate product being delivered in that

7 license than with respect to the other markets

that you talked about?

A If we take that hypothetical that the movie producer wants Frank Sinatra's singing of Moon River, is the Moon River copyright part of the sound recording? Yes. I would agree with that.

Q So the musical work is just an input in the final product in that instance, no differently than the other examples that you talked about earlier.

A Well, now you're getting to discomparable to what I've talked about with respect to the industry in general and the use of something as an input. That's sort of hard to say that by picking a hypothetical you've

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

captured what I've described as the general pattern in the industry.

Did you look at the volume of licenses that were the subject of Dr. Jaffe's study in 2001?

A I did at that time. I don't recall specific numbers.

1 2

3

4

5

6

19

20

21 22

> 1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

7 8 And your -- By the way there is 9 some degree to which you keep on referring to 10 that as a study in 2001. You're familiar, are you not, with the testimony in this case that 11 12 the existence of effectively a one-to-one 13 relationship between musical work license fees for synch rates and master use license fees 14 from the sound recording owners continues to 15 16 be predominantly one-to-one to this day? 17 Correct? 18

A You have to point me to something specific.

Ms. Ulman's testimony, the 0 testimony of Mr. Simson of Sound Exchange and I believe the testimony of several of the

Page 132

Jaffe's study excluded situations where there 1 2 were cover bands precisely not to have a 3 disproportion between where there was just a 4 synch right without a master use right?

That doesn't matter.

Excuse me? 0

JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Mr. Steinthal, how are you defining cover bands in your question?

10 MR. STEINTHAL: In my question, I 11 mean --

JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Because as you know there are well known artists who do covers.

MR. STEINTHAL: That's not what I was referring to. I think my question and let me try to clarify with him.

BY MR. STEINTHAL:

When you use the phrase "cover bands," are you referring to the fact or the circumstance where a studio hires a band to play a song and thereby pays only a synch

Page 131

labels as well. But there is no dispute in the case, is there, that the licensing of master use rights on the one hand and the sounding recording and sync rights on the other tends in virtually all circumstances to have a value of one-to-one to each other?

That might well be but his study was of 2001 licenses. So that's his analysis.

And do you have any evidence whatsoever that the relationship is anything other than one-to-one even in the circumstances where the producer wants a sound recording for purposes of the given scene, movie, theme, whatever?

I don't know what the producer wants and I can't tell that based on what it bought because it might have negotiated in such a way that it didn't have to pay much more for the specific sound recording than it would have for a cover band or some other sound recording.

Are you aware of the fact that Dr.

right for the musical work but not a master

use right for a prior recording of that work?

I refer to it where there is a substitute whether it is that's the exact arrangement undertaken or some other method to substitute for the existing sound recording.

So you're now saying that the mere fact that one has a choice whether it be in the sound recording or the musical work is a 10 cover situation?

No. I'm just saying that the exact nature of how the movie producer arranges or creates a different sound recording is what's relevant and I'd consider -- You had a specific example of the way that rights are established in that case. The studio could just as easily pay a band to make the recording and let that band have a sound recording right and pay them the right.

20 Do you have any information to 21 challenge the proposition that when studios seek to use a previously performed song in an

Page 133

existing sound recording as part of their TV show or movie that in that situation the rates or anything other than one-to-one with the synch right associated with the embedded musical work?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

No, and I would not expect them to be. It doesn't influence my opinion or the statements about Dr. Jaffe's approach.

Let me ask you this. Even if you accept that Product No. 1 is an input into a final product, okay, we'll call it Product 2, it's not necessarily the case that the aspects of the final product unrelated to Product 1, the input, are themselves worth more than the input. Isn't that right?

I would agree with that. I think the term you're looking for is "value-added."

Dr. Pelcovits, is it fair to say that one hallmark of a competitive market is the ability to choose from competing suppliers who offer products that are substitutable one for the other?

1 A Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

17

18

19

20

21

22

And isn't that very 0 characteristic, one that you noted with respect to the market for the licensing of musical work synchronization rights and sound recording master use rights?

> A Yes.

8 Q So then going back to the chart on 9 page 4, is it a fair summary that all of the 10 instances that you refer to on page 4 are instances in where the sound recording owners 11 12 are not subject to a marketplace in which 13 there is substitutability generally, whereas 14 Dr. Jaffe's market is distinguishable 15 precisely because it is a market in which 16 there is substitutability?

I think that's wrong from two standpoints. I think it's wrong from the standpoint of the fact that if you take substitutability to the level at which it exists in Dr. Jaffe's synch rights markets where the users are relatively or could be

Page 135

I think my answer is no. I'm not sure I understand your question.

Let me try it this way. Is it true that in a market characterized by multiple sellers and multiple buyers who have the ability to choose from substitutable products in that market that those are characteristics of a competitive market?

So you're talking about the ability directly of the buyers and sellers to choose, not necessarily the inputs to the suppliers because that's the way I understood your question.

A hypothetical market where you have multiple sellers of substitutable products and multiple buyers that have choices among the different product offerers. Isn't that a hallmark of a competitive market?

A I'd say generally that is.

And isn't it true that the ability to choose among substitutes acts as a constraint on pricing by suppliers generally?

relatively indifferent between a sound 1

2 recording of the Beatles and a sound recording

3 of someone or some cover band performing a

4 Beatles song, they might be very well

5 substitutable in that market, but that's not

6 an indication of more competitive. It's an

7 indication of a market where you've seen no

8 particular value attached to the Beatles

9 versus some cover band and that's not

10 characteristic of the way music is purchased

11 in general. That's the way it's an exception.

12 It's not the fact that there's more

13 competition. It's the fact you've taken away

14 or you've looked at the case where the value

15 of the sound recording copyright is much 16

lower.

17

18

19

20

21

22

The other way in which you said is or what you posed I disagree with is I think the master income market is a good example where there is far from being a need for a complete catalog. There is a lot - There is not a demand by consumers I believe for a full

Page 136

Page 137

Page 138

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

catalog of ring tones. There should be and I expect there to be a significant amount of substitutability there from one sound recording to another, but it's clearly not at level that it is in the synch rights market.

I'll stand by your first discussion of substitutability in the ring tone market and come back to that in the briefing. Let me ask you this question 10 however. With respect to circumstances where I want a given sound recording in the musical 12 work and sound recording synch rights and master use rights market, you don't know of any evidence, do you, that the sound recording 14 right attracts a higher rate than the musical 16 work right? Correct?

I don't know of any case where I can find out how badly a particular movie producer wanted a particular sound recording. I think that's impossible to analyze.

Because in part with respect to the licensing in that market, at some degree 1 whether or not to invest. My only question

> 2 here was with respect to each new album don't

3 the record companies face the should 4

we/shouldn't we invest decision that they faced before the advent of webcasting?

They face the same decision to invest or not but that decision is based and will take into account different considerations when there is webcasting versus when there is not.

And on page 3 where you talk about the criticism relating to relatively small webcasting revenues not being irrelevant, are you positing here essentially that a profit maximizing entity will always seek to charge a price that maximizes the benefits to it?

Yes, I'd say specifically maximizing profits and by "profits," I would mean long-run profits.

And then in your sentence that ends in the middle of the page on page 3, you say that "the record companies perceive that

Page 139

if the price being sought is too high, you can choose another Sinatra song that may be

published by a different musical work owner or

in the catalog of a different record company. Right? You do have some degree of choice.

I don't disagree that the existence of choices affects prices. What I was disagreeing with is whether it was possible to use evidence from the synch rights market to try to find how much a movie producer values a particular sound recording. I just don't know what they would have paid and how important it was to them. All he has is evidence on what the transactions that actually occurred which were subject to whatever marketplace pressures were existing at the time.

Let me ask you a few questions about what's in your written statement before I move onto a different subject. Why don't you turn to page 2. You make a point here about sunk costs and the decision about

Page 141

1 the market for the sales of physical products

2 such as CDS long their primary source of

3 revenue is steadily eroding and a digital

4 distribution of music through webcasting and

5 other digital distribution channels is what 6 they must increasingly look to for their cost

7 recovery and profits in the future." Let me

8 ask you this. Are you aware of the data in

9 the case that shows that if you just look at

10 the sales of music and look at not just

physical CDs but also sales of downloads and 11

sales to subscription on-demand services that 12

13 are your benchmark market that the combination

14 of CDs sales which may be lower but plus-ed up

15 by iTunes and other digital download sales and

revenues from subscription on-demand services 16

that in fact the record companies now are 17

18 making more than they were making three or 19 four years ago?

20 I think that depends on which 21 years you use as a comparison and the RIAA 22 data which is on shipments of both CDs and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 2

sales of digital downloads, I recall that revenues over the last several years have declined.

Q Well, if in fact the record companies are now making more than they were two years ago and three years ago and four years ago from sales defined to mean not just sales of CDs but sales of CDs or permanent downloads, digital downloads and subscriptions where you get your on-demand streaming and conditional downloads. Would that change your testimony if in fact they're making more from the sale of music now than they were before?

A If that were true, it would not change anything in my testimony. Basically the testimony again, and I want to make sure it's clear here, is that sellers will care about what they make in any market regardless of whether it's small or large and this is many millions of dollars and to say that this is an afterthought to these companies and they would not seek to maximize their profits in

Page 144

may not be sold individually by the publisher or the record company?

A I don't understand that question.

Q Well, are you familiar with the fact that there are certain record companies and music publishers that issue catalog licenses to studios or producers so that basically they can choose from their catalog as they see fit in the middle of a production schedule to choose this song or that song, this record or that record, to be used within a film?

A I don't recall that specifics but I'll accept that if you want me to.

Q Hypothetically, isn't it true if you accept that there's the opportunity to do a catalog license so that I'll pay you X dollars per synch right or per master use right for your catalog basically avoiding transactions costs on a license by license basis? There would still be substitutability existing in the market for synch licensing and

Page 143

that market because it's small it's nonsensical to me.

I think we all agree that entities will profit maximize to the extent they can. So that's not the issue. Now take a look if you will at page 5. And you make a statement here on the issue of substitutability within the synch and master use market that I wanted to ask you about. In the middle of the paragraph, the long paragraph in the middle, you say "Instead the evidence Dr. Jaffe relies on from the synch and master use market is from a market where the users purchase individual sound recordings or musical works and therefore, have the ability to find substitutes for both the musical works and sound recordings." Now my question relates to your focus on the word "individual" here. Isn't the substitutability a consequence of the fact that the license decision is being made before the music is put into the film

rather than the fact that the license may or

master use licensing in that marketplace setting, wouldn't there?

A There would be substitutability from the standpoint that the movie producer could after the fact choose or after the broad license was entered into could choose which particular musical work to put in the movie.

Q Or if it had a deal which basically said I'm going to pay X units per synch right or master use right but didn't tie you to a certain minimum per year you'd still have substitutability in terms of the ability to choose Warner's sound recording or Universal's sound recording and it's that opportunity to choose that creates the substitutability, isn't it?

A No, I think the substitutability is simply that when it comes down to it, the music, I'm sorry, the movie studio can easily use one of many different songs for its purposes. It doesn't have a demand or a very strong demand for one piece of music over the

Page 146 Page 148 other. 1 Do you recall doing that? 1 2 2 Yes. It's true, is it not, that 3 somebody that uses a DMCA complaint radio 3 Relative to broadcast radio, wouldn't it be fair to say that the webcasting station doesn't have the ability to pull the 4 5 industry remains in a nascent state? 5 particular song it wants to choose at a given point in time? Isn't that right? 6 I would use the term "nascent" to 6 mean quite early. It's sort of just forming. 7 7 That's true of the consumer that 8 So I think webcasting has gone beyond being they can't select on a song-by-song basis. It 9 9 doesn't mean that they don't have a strong nascent, but I certainly would agree that it 10 demand for a music service that has particular 10 has not developed to nowhere near developed to 11 the same point as broadcast terrestrial radio. 11 sets of titles in their repertoire. 12 MR. STEINTHAL: I think this is a 12 Now you agree, do you not, that 13 RIAA had projections of subscription 13 good time to break. I'm going to go onto a 14 information, revenue information, for the SDAR 14 different subject. 15 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: All right. 15 services when it negotiated the voluntary We'll recess until 2:00 p.m. Off the record. 16 agreement with the SDAR services. Correct? 16 17 (Whereupon, at 12:31 p.m., the That's what I understand from Mr. 17 18 above-entitled matter recessed to reconvene at 18 Marks' deposition. 19 2:03 p.m. the same day.) 19 And you'd agree as well, wouldn't 20 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the 20 you, that when the SDAR services/RIAA 21 record. We'll come to order. Mr. Steinthal. 21 agreement was negotiated in 2003 there was 22 22 some uncertainty on both sides as to whether CROSS EXAMINATION (Cont'd.) Page 147 Page 149 BY MR. STEINTHAL: 1 the services would meet or exceed those 1 2 2 Good afternoon, Dr. Pelcovits. projections? Q 3 Good afternoon, Mr. Steinthal. 3 Yes, in general, although I assume A 4 I'm going to shift subjects to the 4 that satellite providers did not have the O 5 SDAR services, XM and Sirius. Okay. You 5 projections that RIAA had. So I think just 6 6 addressed the rates charged by the SDAR responding to the question there's significant 7 7 services starting at page 6 of your testimony. uncertainty on both sides. Now if the parties to the 2003 8 8 \mathbf{A} Yes. 9 voluntary agreement between the SDAR services 9 Now is it a correct statement that 10 you agree with the proposition that webcasters 10 and RIAA had negotiated a percentage of revenue, you can't say one way or the other 11 11 and the XM and Sirius SDAR services share whether the fee would be higher or lower for important characteristics? 12 12 13 13 a nascent industry, can you? A Yes. 14 I think that would still possibly 14 Q Such as? 15 play a role even in a percentage of revenue 15 They both stream music to listeners very often without commercial and 16 fee. 16 17 Wouldn't it depend on both 17 without any user control over the stream. 18 parties' expectations and projections of where 18 And you refer on page 6 at the 19 the industry was going to go? 119 bottom, the last paragraph, on this page to [€] ∰20 20 Well, it certainly would still satellite radio having been a nascent industry at the time of the negotiations of the SDAR 21 depend on that, yes. 21 22 I just didn't hear the end. 22 services voluntary deal with Sound Exchange.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

I said yes, it still would depend on their projections of where the industry was going.

Q And you don't know whether the parties to that negotiation, meaning the SDARS agreement and RIAA, actually thought about what they thought about the agreement in terms of a projected percentage of revenue. You don't know what they thought about that. Correct?

A I don't know what they projected or expected as far as what this would translate into as far as a percentage of revenue.

O Did you do any inquiry into what the sellers of the sound recordings were projecting for the SDAR service revenues over the time period of the license?

No, I did not.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

0 Did you examine public projections from analysts with respect to the two SDAR services at the time in 2003 when this

Page 152 1 Did you factor into your analysis any of the information that you gleaned from 2

those public reports?

The only thing I factored in is a recognition that this was very, very early in the stage of the industry and that therefore was going to be very difficult or it would have been difficult at the time to have a good projection of where the industry was going.

But that uncertainty would exist on both sides between the satellite services and RIAA. Correct?

A Yes.

Now you say in the first paragraph Q on page 7, four lines down, that the market has changed drastically or dramatically in three years. Let me ask you this question. Would you agree that the change in the SDARS

18 19 business would not affect the validity of the

20 2000 agreement as a benchmark for webcasting

21 if what you were trying to do was to draw an

22 analogy based on what the expectations were in

Page 151

agreement was entered into?

I did not. I actually did not. I've looked at some analyst, quite a lot of analysts' reports, on this industry and I did not see any from back then.

Well, the companies were public companies that were making quarterly filings, were they not, XM and Sirius?

They were public companies then, A yes.

And just to be clear you don't conduct any independent examination or investigation as to what was publicly reported about their projections at that time?

Their own projections you mean? A

Q

I do recall looking at their public statements that I cite here, the XM 10K. That's newer, but I did look at the statements. I don't recall what they said at the time about their projections of ultimate subscription levels.

2003?

I'm not sure I understand the A question.

O Well if -- You're familiar with utilization of benchmarks based on the circumstances at the time that benchmark agreement is entered into. Right?

A Yes.

And if we were focused on expectations as of 2003, then the fact that business has changed, circumstances have changed, since 2003 doesn't effect the validity of looking at the expectations surrounding the benchmark agreement. Correct?

Correct if you could really go back and find out something about expectations. Yes.

And you didn't go back and try to find anything out. Right?

20 I did not go back and find 21 anything out. 22

At the bottom of page 7, you

mention statutory factors. Do you see that?

A Yes.

Q Now you don't know whether consideration of those factors would have raised or lower the actual negotiated price as between the SDAR services and RIAA, do you?

A I don't know and I think as I point out there what's most important is I don't know what the parties would have expected the use of those statutory factors to do and how they would influence the decision of the copyright royalty panel at that time.

Q It's true, is it not, that in the kind of negotiation leading to a lump sum agreement that occurred with the SDAR services and RIAA the flat fee that emerges may be presumed to factor in each side's evaluation of the marketplace information that they had?

A Well, I think that along with other things. It's not just the marketplace, but their expectations of how the copyright court would rule absent an agreement.

Page 156

Let me try to -- I'm not sure whether you said the word "favored" is what the problem was. But it's true, is it not, that you don't have any reason to believe that the fact that a lump sum agreement was arrived at in the 2003 negotiation with or as between the SDAR services and RIAA resulted in a more beneficial outcome to one side than the other?

A In and of itself, I don't know everything else being equal who that would have favored.

Q You make a point on page 7 in evaluating the SDARS agreement with RIAA that there was a desire to avoid costs of litigating. Do you see that in the paragraph starting "Finally" on page 7?

A Yes.

Q In a situation where the deal is between the RIAA on behalf of the record companies and all of the SDAR services so that there's no one else left to bring a CARP or CRB proceeding, in fact RIAA could avoid

Page 155

Q But there's no presumption you would draw that the entering into an agreement on a lump sum basis based on a consideration of all the information that each party has favors one side or the other to that lump sum agreement. Correct?

A I'm -- Let me make sure I understand. Are you saying this specifically with respect to a lump sum agreement or with respect to the agreement in general?

Q With respect to the 2003 SDARS agreement with RIAA which resulted as you know in a lump sum agreement over a period of years, you don't have any basis to presume that it's being entered into on a lump sum basis favored one side or the other at that time. Correct?

A Yes, but I would not use the term "favored" really. It would be sort of was it "sought by" or "preferred" by one party or another I think is what I would say. I don't know based on the agreement about that.

totally the cost of litigating by entering

2 into a voluntary agreement with XM and Sirius

3 at that time. Right?

A Yes, that's my understanding of the situation.

Q And that's a different situation than it is in the Section 114 Compulsory License where even if RIAA could reach an agreement with the commercial webcasters it might still have to incur essentially the same costs of litigation against terrestrial simulcasters, smaller webcasters and non-profits. Right?

A Yes.

Now you say that the -- Let me get that language here. In the last sentence, you say "Indeed the SDARS agreement is an even poorer benchmark because the negotiators might have been uncertain how the different statutory factors would be interpreted which would have colored the negotiation of that voluntary agreement." I have a couple

questions about that. First of all, isn't it common for participants in a marketplace negotiation to negotiate in uncertain circumstances?

A Certainly.

Q And the result of marketplace negotiation in uncertain circumstances is generally one where each side evaluates the uncertainties and comes to an agreement based on their evaluation of whether it's at the end of the day worth doing. Isn't that right?

A Yes, I would put it as rather than "comes to agreement" there is they accept the terms of the agreement given their expectations of what they think will happen absent the agreement.

Q And you wouldn't throw out of your consideration of marketplace agreements to consider in a given market agreements that are entered into between parties merely because there was some uncertainty in the market. Isn't that right?

Page 160

factoring in whatever uncertainties they facedin the marketplace. Right?

A It doesn't tell you how they arrived it at. It tells you what they arrived at and then the issue is can you use that as a benchmark in light of both the differences between this market and let's say the market that we're dealing with in this case as well as trying to understand what the parties were thinking at the time.

Q Now you're aware, are you not, of Sound Exchange's position in the current SDARS case. Right?

A Yes.

15 Q You're actually testifying as an 16 expert in that case for Sound Exchange, are 17 you not, as well?

A I have filed testimony, correct.

Q And you're aware then, are you not, that the Sound Exchange position is that the statutory factors under Section 801(b) which govern the determination in that case do

Page 159

A I would not. That in and of itself would not disqualify an agreement if I had a sufficient confidence in the ability to understand how the parties reacted to the uncertainty.

Q There are things like ranges of inflation that are unknown, supply conditions that are unknown, in everyday circumstances in a market. Isn't that right?

A There is certainly uncertainty, yes.

Q And the existence of those uncertainties doesn't render the underlying agreements from being appropriate reflections of marketplace behavior. Correct?

A It doesn't render it as long as you can get a handle on it and interpret the situation correctly.

Q And ultimately the outcome of the SDAR service negotiations with RIAA tells us how Sound Exchange or RIAA and the SDAR services arrived at a compromise after

Page 161

not require and should not be construed so as
to establish royalty rates lower than would
arrive in a fair market value analysis?
Correct?

A That's correct with respect to the first three factors. There's a fourth factor dealing with the impact on the SDARS industry and that is a different consideration that for certain circumstances could affect the rate and support something different than what the market might arrive at.

Q Isn't the Sound Exchange position that consideration of that factor combined with everything else is such that the CRB should not establish a rate lower than a fair market value rate?

A The position is that it should establish a rate over the lifetime of the agreement and in particular in this case towards the end of the period of the agreement, then would be arrived at by a market. But certainly it could have been an

Page 162 important factor back in 2003 at the early 2 stages of the industry and even more 3 important, the question would be what Sound 4 Exchange might have thought the CARP would 5 have done based on those factors back then. 6 But as you testified earlier, you 7 didn't evaluate that in your analysis. 8 Correct? 9 \mathbf{A} I did not try to reproduce what 10 the parties were expecting back in 2003. 11 And just to be clear, you don't 12 know how the parties evaluated the 801(b) 13 factors in arriving at the lump sum agreement

that was entered into in 2003. Correct? Yes, although to be precise, in my mind it doesn't matter what they evaluated to be on their own. It's what they project the court would do when it evaluated those factors.

20 Q Just one question on the subject of the Yahoo deals with independent record companies.

1 particular agreements.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

3

4

5

6

9

12

13

14

15

16

22

Is there anything about that statement that's not applicable to your analysis of the sound recording and musical work marketplace more generally?

I'm not sure I understand your question.

Well, does this statement apply no O differently to your benchmark interactive service market?

It does not apply to the ones I A relied on for purposes of developing my benchmark rate and applying the benchmark rate.

Why would this statement be applicable to agreements between Yahoo and independent record companies but not applicable to agreements between the four major record companies and small interactive webcasters?

It potentially could be a factor if they were looking at agreements with small

Page 163

Q That you address in your statement. Do you have any reason to believe that the independent record companies that entered into these arrangements with Yahoo were thinking that they were not in their best interest to do so?

A No.

A

Yes.

9 0 Turn to page 9 of your written 10 statement. This is part of your evaluation of 11 the Yahoo agreements with the independent 12 record companies. In the last sentence of 13 that page, you say, "As the CARP recognized in 14 2002, agreements between large sophisticated 15 players and small entities with little market 16 share should carry little weight at 17 benchmark." Do you see that? 18 \mathbf{A} Yes.

Q That statement is generally applicable to the marketplace that you're evaluating here?

I think it's applicable to these

Page 165

1 interactive webcasters, but I was looking at 2 large interactive webcasters.

Let's follow that through. Do you know what the market capitalization of MusicNet is?

 \mathbf{A}

7 0 Do you know what the market share 8 of MusicNet is?

A

10 Q Do you know the capitalization of 11 Napster LLC?

No, it was -- No, I do not know. I am more than -- Well, there's no question pending.

What about MusicNow before it was acquired by AOL? Any idea what its capitalization was?

17 18

 \mathbf{A}

19 Is it fair to say then that you 20 didn't evaluate the marketplace size of either Napster, MusicNet or MusicNow? 21

That's correct.

19

20

21

22

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Q And what about Musicmatch before it was acquired by Yahoo? Any idea how it fared in the market in terms of its market size?

A No.

Q Now on page 10 you talk about certain rights that are sometimes sold together in a bundle. Let me ask you this question. Do you agree with the proposition that it is difficult to judge the willingness to pay for one component part of a bundled service offering based on the price of the bundle as a whole?

A If that's the only information you have, I would agree with that.

Q So that if all we have is information that a consumer is willing to pay X for a bundle of products and services for the entire bundle, you'd agree that it tells us virtually nothing about what the consumer is willing to pay for any one individual component of the bundle.

Page 168

unit and 90 percent of the demand is willing to pay no more than \$1.10 per unit. Do you remember that?

A Yes.

Q And I asked you whether the supplier would be better off charging \$9 or \$1.10 assuming a seller has to charge one price and you agreed with the proposition that selling at \$1.10 to 90 percent of the market makes more sense. Right?

A If that indeed are the correct assumptions of the hypothetical that those that pay \$1.10 will not pay anything more.

Q And you didn't raise the issue of cannibalization at the time when we had our question and answer back a few months ago. Correct?

A I believe I said that if those are the assumptions you gave me that's the calculation I get.

Q Now in reference to your testimony about cannibalized customers here, can you

Page 167

A I wouldn't say "virtually nothing." It does give us how much the customer is willing to pay for the bundle and then depending on what the components are and what more you know about the prices of those components in the marketplace, you can infer certain things.

Q Well, let's keep it clear as to what we know and what we don't know. Is it fair to say that you cannot infer from the willingness to pay X for a bundle of products and services that the buyer is expressing a willingness to pay any particular amount for specific component parts of the bundle?

A If that's all you know, yes.
Q Turn to page 12 if you would.

Talk about the hypothetical that I asked you about the first time around and explain certain aspects of it. Now first of all, this, to remind the panel, you're referring to the hypothetical where 10 percent of the demand in the market is willing to pay \$9 per

point me to any record evidence in this case of subscription customers who have been cannibalized by advertiser supported services?

A I've seen no evidence that quantifies that effect. I believe the similarity of those services, the offering by many companies of both type services and the combined growth in the market of both type services is very strong indication that these are not completely independent markets where the price charged in one has no effect on the demand in the other.

Q But just to be clear, you did nothing to seek to try to quantify or find any evidence of actual cannibalization of the nature that you posit at this part of your paper. Correct?

A I did not try to quantify it with respect to the basis of my statement and information I relied on. I did what I described in my previous answer.

Q Did you consider efforts made by

Page 172 Page 170 And you agree that if the price Yahoo to up-sell customers to its subscription 1 1 2 were \$1.10 everyone would pay the \$1.10. 2 product? Are you familiar with the word "up-3 3 sell"? Right? 4 Yes. 4 Yes, I have read about that. \mathbf{A} A 5 But you have ten percent of the 5 Q Do you remember Mr. Roback's O customers who would have paid the \$9 if the 6 6 testimony that it was an extremely difficult 7 \$1.10 service wasn't available. Right? 7 proposition to up-sell and support its service 8 users to the subscription service? 8 Yes, although it's -- It depends 9 I read that. I also saw figures 9 what we take as the hypothetical and I understand the hypothetical to be that there 10 10 showing Yahoo's subscription services growing 11 are 10 who are paying \$9 for the service. 11 in percentage terms? 12 But in the hypothetical those are 12 Well, that does tell us anything 13 the 10 that are willing to pay \$9 even if the about cannibalization, does it, because we 13 14 only offering out there were \$9 and there don't know whether those people that are 14 wasn't a \$1.10 offering. Right? 15 15 buying it were actually up-sold from the ad supported service? Right? 16 Yes. 16 17 We can't say anything in terms of 17 Q Why aren't those 10 your cannibalized customers in the hypothetical? quantifying that but I think it's a reasonable 18 18 19 judgment based on what we've seen in the Well, they might well be 19 20 market. 20 cannibalized customers in which case the way the example would work out is you would have 21 It's your reasonable judgment. 21 Q 22 It is my reasonable judgment. 22 to compare the revenues with it never -- Let A Page 173 me restate that. If the hypothetical is that 1 Now you would describe a customer 1 2 these are exactly the willingness to pay and 2 who would pay for the subscription services in 3 the hypothetical if he or she didn't have the 3 that the customers that would be willing to 4 pay \$9 in the absence of or in the presence of 4 choice of non-subscription services as one 5 5 that would be willing to pay for the the lower price service would only pay \$1.10, 6 there was only one price, then this is the 6 subscription service at the subscription 7 7 result that you get. But if this is to bear service price. Isn't that right? 8 8 any relationship to what we see in the market, A Yes. 9 then I interpret the number 90/10, the split 9 And those are the customers that 10 you describe as having been cannibalized. 10 of the market, as not the split of customers 11 and their willingness to pay, but the split of 11 Right? 12 12 what you see in the market in terms of the Yes. A 13 number of customers who buy the lower price 13 So let me see if I understand 14 service and the number who buy the higher this. You criticize my hypothetical for not 14 15 price service. 15 taking a count of cannibalized customers. 16 But that 10 percent would be the 16 Right?

17

18

19

20

21 22 wouldn't it?

17

18

19

20

21

22

A

Yes.

Yes.

Now I proposed a hypothetical in

which 10 percent of the customers were willing

to pay \$9 per unit and 90 percent were not

willing to pay more than \$1.10. Right?

cannibalized universe in the hypothetical,

looking at a market where there were 90

It would be in a hypothetical

where you set up the hypothetical not based on

customers buying the low price, 10 customers

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

22

buying the high price. But if you set your 2 hypothetical by saying, this is no 3 relationship to what I see in the market, but I'm telling you that there are only 10 5 customers who will pay \$9 and there are 90 6 customers who will only pay \$1.10.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

But it's true, is it not, if both are in the market, if you have this offering for \$9 in the market and 10 people are taking it and an offering for \$1.10 in the market and 90 people are taking it because there is some differentiation in the actual offering that that's the marketplace choosing how many people are willing to pay the \$9 for the differentiation, isn't it?

At current prices, that is, but it does not achieve what you suggested which is that does not represent your cannibalized customers, meaning that does not represent the customers that would pay for the higher price service were the lower price service not available. We don't see that in the market.

Page 176

month, yes.

Now is the definition of "unique listeners" you used any person that spends any time listening to the service at all?

I don't recall if it was any or there has to be a certain amount of time that the customer is actually online at any point during the month.

As you sit here today, you don't know whether it includes or doesn't include people that listen for less than 15 minutes a month for example?

I believe it would certainly. If I recall correctly, it would include those that listen to it for 15 minutes a month. It might not include those that listen to it for a minute or 30 seconds or two minutes.

So you believe it does include everyone that listened for at least 15 minutes in a month. You just don't know if it includes people that may have listened for less than 15 minutes a month.

Page 175

By the way, I didn't see in your analysis any consideration of the testimony from Mr. Roback that the future business opportunity in this marketplace lies in the \$20 billion ad supported market and not a subscription marketplace in which people aren't used to paying for radio. Is that in your analysis here?

It's not in my analysis. It's in my testimony.

I want to ask you some questions on the issue of the buy button that you testified about this morning. It's in your testimony on page 20.

Okay. Thank you.

Now of the several million unique listeners. Since that's in shaded provisions of your testimony, I won't read out the number 18 of unique listeners that you've referred and 20 these are unique listeners per month. Is that 21 right?

A Unique listeners in a particular

Right. \mathbf{A}

Okay. Now do you know how many of that universe of unique listeners listen for say less than an hour a month?

I don't know that.

You would agree, would you not, with the proposition that if there were promotional value in webcasting it would manifest itself in respect of people that spent more than just a couple of minutes a month on the website?

It would be much more manifest in those that listen more, yes.

And you didn't try to do any calculations stratifying the universe of unique listeners. Right?

I did not although the subscription customers who account for a lot of the buy buttons here are certainly listening to this service I would expect quite a bit or they would not subscribe.

Now you mentioned this morning

Page 178 Page 180 that this analysis doesn't cover purchases 1 O Per track. 2 2 that are made by a consumer at a venue other A Yes. 3 So if I'm looking at the paragraph than from clicking on the buy button. Right? 3 starting "The evidence however..." on page 20. 4 A Yes. 4 5 Q 5 Do you see that? Did you seek to look at any data 6 6 reflecting purchases made by users of Yahoo or \mathbf{A} Yes. 7 any of the other services not immediately to 7 So if we ascribe, let's round it 8 buy button but by clicking on, for example, 8 up from 99 cents to \$1. Okay? 9 Amazon or iTunes? 9 I'm fine with that. 10 10 So if we call it \$1 a download for Separate from their use of a buy 11 the figure that is shaded in the middle, the button, I have not seen any analysis of that 11 12 particular issue. There is a reference to 12 numbers of downloads sold over a six month 13 something by a Mr. Hansen, but not a set of 13 period, then the average price of a digital 14 14 album is \$10 an album. Is it not? numbers or a study. 15 Isn't it true that the customers' 15 A Yes. technology that they use may dictate how they 16 16 0 So if we add the two up, I don't 17 17 buy music? think we're breaching any great privilege here 18 I'm not sure I understand what you 18 to say that in the six month period there A 19 19 mean. would be if I add those two figures up based 20 For example, if I have an iPod and 20 on actual buy button sales somewhere in the Q 21 I'm an iTunes user, if I hear a song listening 21 neighborhood of \$2.5 million in revenue to the 22 to Launchcast, wouldn't you agree with me that 22 sound recording owners over that six months. Page 179 Page 181 1 the likelihood is if I'm going to buy a 1 Right? 2 2 digital download I'm going to switch over to A Hang on one second. 3 iTunes where I have compatible ways of buying 3 I'm multiplying the number of Q 4 and using of my iPod? 4 digital albums by 10. 5 5 That would be true for - I think \mathbf{A} Okay. 6 6 I would agree with that for iPod users and And I'm multiplying the number of 7 7 obviously for non iPod users they would find digital download unit sales by \$1. 8 8 it very easy to get downloads from the music \mathbf{A} By one essentially. 9 9 service and certainly for CD purchases it Don't we come up with 10 wouldn't matter whether someone was an iPod 10 approximately \$2.5 million? No. I'm multiplying the smaller 11 users or some other type of customer. 11 12 12 number here by 10 and that gives me a Are you familiar with how much of 13 the digital download market iTunes represents 13 relatively low number. I'm multiplying the in the United States? 14 other one by one. So I'm adding together this 14 15 15 shaded number starting with four to the 10 I have seen that. I know it's 16 very large. I don't recall the exact number. 16 times the shaded number starting in one and I

17

18

19

20

21

22

Q

get a number below \$1 million.

real numbers because I'm lost.

All right.

We're going to have to -- I'm

Or maybe I'm just doing my math

going to have to ask these questions using

21 generally 99 cents?22 A Per track, yes.

Q Let's look at the numbers themselves. Now assuming the generally

prevailing price for a digital download, you're familiar with the fact that it's

17

18

19

20

Page 184 Page 182 And of course that would turn into 1 1 wrong. 2 \$5 million over a year. Right? 2 JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: There's a 3 3 Yes. precedent for that in this room. 4 Is it your testimony that \$5 4 MR. STEINTHAL: Excuse me? 5 million in supplemental purchases is an 5 JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: There's 6 irrelevant number? 6 precedent for that in this room. 7 No. 7 \mathbf{A} MR. STEINTHAL: Yes, I'm sure. 8 Let me ask you some questions 8 BY MR. STEINTHAL: Q about the issue of definition of revenue. 9 9 The number of downloads is equal to the number of dollars, right, because we're THE WITNESS: I beg the Court's 10 10 indulgence for a two minute break. applying \$1 per? 11 11 12 A Yes. 12 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Sure. 13 THE WITNESS: Okay. And then the number of digital 13 Q CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: We'll go 14 albums -- Okay. Sorry. 14 ahead and take our scheduled time at this time 15 I see where we're differing. I'm 15 A 16 and break 10 minutes. looking at the --16 17 THE WITNESS: Okay. Thanks. 17 Q Two different places in here. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Off the 18 18 Okay. 19 19 record. A All right. That's the problem with trying to 20 (Whereupon, at 2:48 p.m., the 20 Q 21 above-entitled matter recessed and reconvened 21 do it my way. 22 22 Now I see where we're -at 3:01 p.m.) Page 183 Page 185 1 If you use your calculations based 1 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the on extrapolating from Sony BMG's market share. 2 record. 3 3 \mathbf{A} Okay. CROSS EXAMINATION (Cont'd.) 4 4 0 You would agree with me, would you BY MR. STEINTHAL: Dr. Pelcovits, I just wanted to 5 not, that over the six month period for which 5 6 you had data you would come to approximately 6 ask you some questions about the backend of \$2.5 million in revenue to the sound recording 7 7 your rebuttal statement in connection with owners derived from buy button sales at Yahoo? 8 your revenue definition testimony and the 8 9 It would be approximately that 9 like. It starts on page 30, I believe. First of all, is it correct that you have no prior 10 number in total for purchase of the digital 10 experience in creating definitions of revenue 11 11 downloads. in agreements such as legal licenses? 12 Q Yes, for that --12 That's correct. I have experience 13 Not necessarily, in fact, not all 13 of it going to the sound recording owners. working a lot with tariff definitions but not 14 14 15 15 specifically with the definitions of revenue Excuse me? in the context of musical recordings. 16 16 A Not all of it going to the sound Or other IP I gather? You have no 17 17 recording owners. 18 Right, but that would be the price 18 experience in defining revenue for purposes of other sales of intellectual property. Isn't paid for the digital downloads and the albums 19 19 would be approximately \$2.5 million over that 20 that a fair statement? 20 21 six months. Right? 21 I have done some other work in IP 22 relating to right-to-use fees for telecom 22 Yes. A

Page 186 switches. I don't recall whether a definitional issue was significant in that case. Q And you've had no experience before this one in analyzing an allocation of revenues for bundled services in webcasting markets. Right?

Yes, that's correct. A

Q Now in your briefly testimony today on the subject of the definition of gross revenue you did say that there was some advantages of specificity in defining revenue for a license pertaining to webcasting. Correct?

Correct. A

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

22

A

And one of those benefits is that 0 it leads to certainty. Correct?

It increases certainty. Yes, that's what I said.

And the avoidance of potential disputes between licensors and licensees if the definitions are rendered fairly specific

think that's a different case. The iPod is not bundled with the iTunes in the sense that it's required to be purchased from the site as a condition of listening to or purchasing iTunes' services.

Well, then I'm a little confused here. Is your testimony that the software should not come into the revenue base as long as it's not required to play the music?

As long as it's not needed in order to subscribe and listen to the music on the service.

So if it's just optional, it shouldn't come into the revenue base.

That -- Yes, that's what I would agree with.

this in a minute. Let's take a look at the actual Sound Exchange definition of revenue to which you refer in your direct testimony. This is actually an attachment to the rebuttal

Now then you -- I'll come back to

Page 187

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

4

10

11

13

16

17

18

19

as to what's included and what's not. Right?

Yes. A

And in particular on page 31 of your written testimony in the first full paragraph you again speak of the benefit of clarity in helping to provide specifics to break down issues from broader categories. Right?

9 Yes. A 10 Let me ask you some questions about your criticism of Mr. Fancher on page 11 12 32. Now first, you criticize his exclusion of revenues from software used to access a music 13 service if the software can also do other 14 15 things such as pay video. Let me press that a little bit. Is it your testimony that when 16 Apple sells an iPod on the iTunes store or 17 18 website the sale of the iPod should come into the revenue base upon which Apple would pay 19 20 for music if it was paying on a percentage 21 basis?

No, that's not my testimony. I

Sound Exchange which is --

or it's part of the rebuttal statement of

2 COURT REPORTER: Twenty-seven. 3 MR. STEINTHAL: We'll mark it as

Services Exhibit R-27.

5 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Is that a 6 different take on what's already an exhibit?

7 MR. STEINTHAL: I thought that we 8 had marked this. I'm not going to put it into 9 evidence, but --

JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: What is it? MR. STEINTHAL: It's the rebuttal

12 statement of Sound Exchange Inc.

JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: That'S R-1.

14 MR. STEINTHAL: That's what I

15 thought, R-1. Good memory, Judge.

BY MR. STEINTHAL:

I believe if you turn to page 12 we gave the section on gross revenues and then the definition of gross revenue proposed by

20 Sound Exchange begins in Section E on page 13.

First of all, Dr. Pelcovits, did you draft 21

this definition of gross revenues? 22

Page 190 Page 192 1 1 $\cdot \mathbf{A}$ No. here. 2 2 What about if I'm going to the Did you participate in the O Q drafting of it at all? 3 Yahoo home page and there is along with the dozens of different things I can do there's an 4 4 I had some discussions with Mr. 5 icon that says I can go to music and you click 5 Perrelli about this topic during the time that 6 on it and it takes you right to the Yahoo 6 it was drafted. 7 7 music home page. Is that indirectly relevant Do you remember which specific 8 and indirectly attributable to the home page 8 parts you provided input about? 9 9 I do. I definitely recall revenue? 10 10 discussing with him the issue of bundled A I think that could be considered services. I know we have some other general 11 indirectly attributable but it is not picked 11 12 discussions, but in terms of the most specific 12 up in any of the definitions later on in the 13 13 document. discussions it dealt with bundled services. Now when you look at the second 14 Let's take a look at the very 14 0 15 first sentence of the definition of gross 15 part of this where it says "Gross revenues shall include but not be limited to..." The revenues. It says, "Gross revenues shall mean 16 16 phrase "include but not be limited to" is 17 all gross monies and other consideration paid 17 hardly specific or delimiting, is it? 18 or payable to or on behalf of any person or 18 19 entity that are directly or indirectly 19 This would be -- Let me make sure attributable to a service including without 20 20 I have the right point. 21 It's on page 13 just before the 21 limitation nonreturnable advances and 22 listing of certain categories that presumably 22 guarantees..." and then it goes on. Did you Page 191 Page 193 1 have any input in the drafting of the 1 are "included but not limited to those that 2 2 "directly or indirectly attributable" Sound Exchange would put into the bucket of 3 3 gross revenues." language? 4 4 A No. A Thank you. 5 Q Excuse me? 5 My question is whether that kind 6 6 of language is -- Let me put it this way. No. A 7 7 Isn't it true that that language is not You would agree with me that that doesn't fall into the bucket of a specific 8 specific or delimiting? 9 definition of revenues with concrete 9 That is possible, yes. categories that provides guidance, does it? 10 10 MR. STEINTHAL: Let's actually go Not without further definition 11 -- I mean in your written testimony you say 11 12 later on in the document. 12 "It's good to look at what the labels 13 themselves have done." So I want you to take 13 What does "indirectly a look at one of the Sony agreements with attributable" mean? 14 14 15 15 Yahoo. So let's mark as Services Rebuttal Well, I would say that includes Exhibit R-27 a document marked "Confidential 16 16 examples of cases here where a customer clicks 17 Short Form Agreement." It bears the Bates 17 via a general music page onto a noninteractive webcast service and to the extent 18 stamped numbers SX18392 and onward. 19 (Whereupon, the document 19 that is attracting the customer to that 20 referred to was marked general music page and there is revenue that 20 21 is received from that I would consider that to 21 as Services Rebuttal 22 Exhibit No. 27 for be indirect but yet something that's picked up

Page 196 Page 194 identification.) after the next sentence. There's a sentence 1 1 2 BY MR. STEINTHAL: 2 that starts "In the event that Sony BMG videos 3 are exhibited in the absence of the video 3 Is this one of the forms of 0 4 player" and skipping the parenthetical, "and agreements between one of the majors and one 5 5 of the webcasters that you had reference to in Yahoo receives monies of the types described 6 giving your testimony on gross revenue 6 in 2 and 3 above which are directly 7 7 attributable to the music video plays, then definition? the label revenue share..." That's an example 8 8 A No. 9 9 where the use of the phrase "directly Do you know specifically which attributable" is used in a record label ones you did and which ones you didn't have 10 10 11 access to? 11 agreement with Yahoo, is it not? 12 12 Yes. A I had access and reviewed the A 13 13 So this is an example where agreements for interactive or what we called they've chosen in a voluntary agreement to use 14 "on-demand webcasting." 14 the phrase "directly attributable" instead of 15 So you didn't bother to look at 15 Q 16 agreements like the video agreement. 16 the phrase "directly or indirectly attributable" which is in the Sound Exchange 17 I did not look at these. 17 18 Did you look at any agreements 18 proposed language. Is that right:? 19 with Yahoo itself and another record company? 19 Yes. A 20 I don't believe so. 20 Q Now let's talk about the bundles 21 21 service aspects of the definition of revenue 0 Let's take a look at page 6 of the 22 document, SX18397. 22 and I think if you turn to page 14 of the Page 195 Page 197 1 1 Sound Exchange rebuttal case in subparagraph A Okav. 2 2 2 at the top this is the part where it refers And if you read the definition of 3 3 to a licensee bundling access to or use of the gross revenues which is in paragraph 4(a) the 4 4 second full sentence, it says "Gross revenues service and I think you testified about that 5 5 in response to the questions from Mr. Handzo means all monies received by Yahoo in 6 6 this morning. Do you remember that? connection with the performance of music 7 7 videos" and then a parenthetical "from" and A Yes. 8 then it lists specific things, "sponsorship 8 Q Now I believe your testimony was 9 9 if there's a standalone or alla carte price specifically of the video player, in-stream 10 advertisements on the video player," I'm 10 for an aspect of the bundle you would support skipping the parentheticals, "banner ads on 11 utilizing that standalone market price when 11 12 you unbundle what's being paid for the actual 12 the video player, synchronized with such inpackage of goods and services that a consumer 13 stream advertisements on the video player and 13 commerce revenue excluding sales of download 14 is buying? 14 15 and packaged media if reasonably tractable on 15 I think what I said is if there the video player." So would you agree with me 16 was a comparable music service available in an 16 17 that that's an example of a definition of 17 alla carte basis, then that should be used as 18 the review for the monthly fee for customers 18 gross revenues that is specific and delimits 19 19 that subscribe to a bundled service that the categories that are within it?

20

21

22

includes a compliant webcast service.

Q Let's take a real world

hypothetical instead of a hypothetical

20

21

22

A

O

Yes.

And then if you skip down in the

next sentence starting "Video." I'm sorry,

Page 201

Page 198

1

2

6

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

hypothetical. Let's take the SBC-Yahoo
service. You are familiar with the fact that,
I'm going to call it SBC-Yahoo even though SBC
is now part of AT&T, but people tend to call
it the SBC-Yahoo bundle. Are you familiar
with that bundle?

A Yes.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

Q It consists principally of high speed internet access, does it not?

A It's high speed internet access bundled with certain Yahoo services.

Q And the Yahoo services that are bundled within it are a suite of services that include enhanced email, virus protection, security features, along with Launchcast Plus music service. Correct?

A Yes.

Q Do you know exactly how many different features there are in the Yahoo media package that forms part of the SBC-Yahoo bundle?

A I do not know the exact number.

definition encompasses more customers than such probably be attributed as Launchcast type customers in this calculation. If there is an

customers in this calculation. If there is an
 alternative way of handling the bundle that
 protects the music service, then I think

that's worth considering.

7 So you would, as a matter of 8 economics, be troubled, wouldn't you, by 9 taking a price paid by an alla carte purchaser 10 that is demonstrating a willingness to by a given product and ascribing that price to the 11 12 same service when it's transposed into a 13 bundle where the majority of the people never 14 even use the service. Right?

A Yes.

Q There's a part of this revenue definition of Sound Exchange beyond the question that I just asked you that I would love to have an explanation since you apparently worked on the bundled service aspect, the last sentence of subparagraph 2 on page 14 says "Where a licensee bundles access

Page 199

Q But it's at least between five and ten different feature, isn't it?

A I think that's about right. I would agree with that.

Q Now are you familiar with the data that reflects how many -- Strike that. Are you familiar with the data the reflects what percentage of the actual SBC-Yahoo bundled subscribers use the Launchcast Plus service?

A I don't recall seeing that.

Q Well, the testimony is that it's a very small fraction in the range of 10 percent of the bundled purchasers that actually at any given time use the Launchcast Plus service. Take that hypothetical if you will. Don't you think that it is inappropriate where 90 percent of the universe of the purchasers of a bundle are not even using a music service to simply use the price paid by alla carte subscription users to the music service as the value when unbundling the bundle?

A I believe that it is that that

to or use of the service," this is the digital

- 2 musical service apparently, "Where a licensee
- 3 bundles access to or use of the service
- 4 either directly or through a third party with
- 5 other products or services and the service is
- 6 not offered on an alla carte basis and does
- 7 not otherwise qualify as a bundled service the
- 8 subscription revenue attributable to the
- 9 service shall be the monthly fee charged for
- 10 the entire bundled service." What's the
- 11 economic explanation for taking the entire
- 12 amount paid for the bundle and ascribing it to
- 13 the revenue base when the music service is
 - only a portion of the bundle?

A I understand that that provision protects the music services again the, I'm sorry, protects the sound recording company, the record companies, from music services designing what I would call phony bundles just to get around the percentage of revenue calculation that's in the rate proposal.

So in another words, maybe I can

Page 202

2

7

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

make that a little clearer. If a music 2 service were to develop that was very 3 attractive and would if sold on its own have a relatively high price and lead to the 5 payment of copyright fees based of a 6 percentage of that revenue it would seem they 7 could get around the percentage of revenue fee 8 by bundling the offering of music with 9 something totally incidental and not of great 10 value. So they could say we offer you a music 11 service and the only way we're offering it is 12 music for \$7 a month along with a, let's just 13 say, memory key worth \$12. In that case, they 14 could develop that service purely in order to 15 evade the percentage of revenue calculation 16 and this is a way to try to protect against 17 what I would consider to be an end run around 18 the revenue calculation.

Q Do you know whether there are other ways to get around gamesmanship than actually creating a provision like this that would also swallow certain good faith

19

20

21

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 have to pay on the entire bundle price?

I would agree with that.

3 Okay. On the subject of this 4 uplift in the usage fee for bundled services 5 where you can't ascribe a revenue figure 6 because of the difficulties in unbundling, did you consider at all in giving your testimony

8 that the 2003 agreement between Sound Exchange

9 and RIAA on the one side and the DiMA 10 companies on the other address the issue of

11 bundled services by basically saving bundled 12 services would pay at the per stream or ATH

rate without having the option of paying on 13 14 the percentage of revenue rate as well?

I was aware of that. I don't think that that's an important consideration because the rate structure is not a greaterthan rate structure.

And you didn't give an credence to the fact that there was a voluntary agreement by the sound recording owners to a structure just two or three years ago which made the

Page 203

situations where the music service is bundled with other services?

Well, I don't know of any. I think it's certainly reasonable to consider them if there was a way to get around that, but I do think the percentage of revenue is an important part of the rate structure and if bundling makes it very, very hard to apply that, then it's necessary to make some other adjustment such as the proposal in my testimony that if you can't use a percentage of revenue calculation because it doesn't follow or fit into one of these categories that you put a surcharge on the per play rate.

We'll come to that in just a minute and that's going to be the last thing we're going to talk about. But before I go there, you'd agree with me, would you not, that if there were less intrusive ways of dealing with the gamesmanship problem that you've identified they would be preferred over provisions that would make innocent parties

option, the webcaster's option, as opposed to a greater-of formula?

I did not give credence to that in the context of a rate proposal that was specifically designed and developed using a greater-than formula which is modeled on the interact market. So, no, I think that the interactive market benchmark formulas are --And to remain consistent with that, that was far preferable than looking at the 2003 agreement.

Well, let's go back to the 2003 structure though for a minute. Are you familiar with the fact that the bundled service rate was exactly the same on per stream or per hour basis as a normal service that wasn't bundled?

A Yes.

Did you give any consideration to the fact that when the issue arose in 2003 about treating bundled services under a per stream or ATH meaning aggregate tuning hour

Page 206

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

22

2

22

basis the labels voluntarily agreed that there wouldn't be a higher rate for a music service delivered as part of a bundle as opposed to one not delivered as part of a bundle?

1

2

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

A Again, my answer would be the same which is it's a different context, a different rate structure. So I don't believe it applies.

Q Did you consider the discussion in the first CARP decision about the precise issue of whether there should be a higher rate for services distributed through a third party than when the same service was distributed directly by a webcaster?

A I did not. I do not see how that compares. It's not necessarily a bundle.

Q Are you familiar with the fact that there was an issue in the first CARP where there were what we call "white label services" where an entity that was a webcaster would deliver the same radio channels that are available directly on a website like AOL or Page 208 Wouldn't the issue be essentially the same?

A No, I think that the white label service there is a pretty good approximation of our alla carte or standalone price. The problem of the bundled service is precisely where there is nothing in the market that you can rely on to get a measure of revenue. There's a service. You've taken music. You've bundled it with some other service and there is no separate price for the music. I don't think that's the same as a rebranding at all.

MR. STEINTHAL: I have nothing further. Thank you.

15 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Joseph.16 MR. JOSEPH: Thank you, Your

17 Honor.

18 CROSS EXAMINATION (Cont'd.) 19 BY MR. JOSEPH:

20 Q Good afternoon, Dr. Pelcovits.

21 A Good afternoon, Mr. Joseph.

Q May I ask you to turn to page 7 of

Page 207

Yahoo but that would be delivered to a third party at their website on a co-branded or branded basis by the third party?

A Yes.

Q Are you familiar with the fact that the sound recording owners argued that stations delivered in that fashion bundled through a third party access vehicle should command a higher per stream rate than traditional webcasting stations?

A I don't recall that I would not consider that to be a bundle. I would consider that to be a branding of something that was otherwise unbranded. That's not a bundle.

Q Do you distinguish that from the bundled service situation?

A I do.

Q In what respect is one more valuable than the other if you can't get at that third party website's revenues where you're delivering that white label service?

1 your written rebuttal testimony please.

A Very well. I have it.

Q Do you see where seven lines up
from the bottom with respect to the SDARS
agreement you say that "the same factors that
DiMA says made the agreement to push forward
rates, a poor benchmark, would have affected
the participants to the SDARS 2003 agreement
in the same way or would have also affected
them?

9 10 11 Α Yes. 12 Q Now earlier today, you said that you were asked about that agreement and a 13 14 reason, in fact the only reason I believe, 15 that you said you believed that it was not a good benchmark was that the 2003 agreement, 16 17 I'm sorry, the 2003 -- Well, they are both 2003 agreements. So now I'm getting sloppy. 18 19 But the 2003 DiMA-RIAA agreement was not a 20 good benchmark was that it was just a 21 temporary agreement to carry forward the rates

to the next, what was then, CARP proceeding.

Do you remember that earlier today? 1 that ad supported webcasting will become more 2 2 lucrative than subscription webcasting. Do I do. 3 3 you see that? It's about halfway down the O Is it your understanding that the 4 4 2003 SDARS agreement was just a temporary page. 5 5 agreement to carry forward existing rates to Yes, I'm not sure he uses the term 6 a next proceeding? 6 "more lucrative" but he says "have a higher 7 7 upside." A No. it was not. 8 8 The next sentence, "will be more Is it your understanding that the Q participants in the 2003 SDARS agreement had 9 9 lucrative." 10 just spent millions of dollars on a CARP for 10 A Oh, he does. Yes. I had a prior period in which a decision had been 11 forgotten the wording. 11 12 rendered? 12 You didn't attempt to analyze that issue on your own, did you? 13 13 A I don't recall that. I did not. 14 14 0 You don't know one way or the A So when you wrote your written 15 other? 15 Q rebuttal testimony you didn't have a view on 16 16 A I don't know one way or the other. 17 that issue as a matter of fact, did you? 17 Is it your understanding that any 18 SDARS fees were then subject to a pending 18 Not as a matter of independent 19 appeal before the D.C. Circuit or any other 19 analysis. 20 20 court? A little further down on page 15 you make a confidential statement about how 21 \mathbf{A} Are you referring to the rates 21 22 the record companies are generally 22 that were agreed to in 2003? Page 213 Page 211 I'm asking whether it's your 1 compensated. Do you see that? 1 2 2 understanding that any SDARS rates were as of A Yes. 3 the time that 2003 agreement was negotiated 3 Now that was a reference back to 4 subject to appending appeal before the DC 4 your benchmark market of interactive services. 5 Circuit or any other court? 5 Correct? 6 6 I do not know. A Yes. A 7 7 Is it your understanding that the Q In fact, you weren't referring to any other market there, were you? 8 8 SDARS 2003 agreement was negotiated for a 9 9 period of just two years? That's correct. 10 I do not recall that. 10 Let me ask you to turn please to page 17. Now in the last paragraph second Let me ask you to turn please to 11 11 sentence you said that "the anecdotal evidence 12 page 15 on your written rebuttal testimony. 12 At the top of that page, you make a 13 13 suggests that both interactive and noninteractive webcasting is substitutional." confidential statement about subscription 14 14 Just so the record is clear, the only 15 services and you cite a Sound Exchange 15 anecdotal evidence to which you are referring 16 exhibit, SX022RR. Do you see that? 16 and here I emphasize the only anecdotal 17 17 A Yes. 18 evidence to which you are referring is what 18 0 You have no basis other than 19 you cite on page 21. Correct? 19 Exhibit 22RR for that statement, do you? 20 20 That's correct. The reference to A That's correct. \mathbf{A} 21 You then refer to Dr. 21 the testimony of the label witnesses. Brynjolfsson's statement in the next paragraph 22 Eisenberg and Kenswil.

Page 216 Page 214 1 A Correct. 1 A Correct. 2 They can go to another website. 2 Q Q Now let me ask you to turn to the 3 Correct? next page, the next page after 17 not after 4 21, on page 18. In the second paragraph in 4 \mathbf{A} That's correct. 5 They could go to a record store. 5 the first sentence, you refer to academic Q literature reaching a conclusion that 6 Correct? 6 7 A 7 terrestrial radio is not promotional and you Correct. 8 On page 19, you discuss some data 8 cite the Liebowitz paper in Footnote 21. Do Q 9 you see that? 9 related to Bonneville. Do you see that in the 10 next to the last paragraph, the last full 10 A I do. paragraph? 11 0 Now it's true, is it not, that the 11 only academic literature you meant when you 12 A I do. 12 Do you understand those data to be said that the academic literature has reached 13 13 14 based on buy button? a contrary conclusion was that article? 14 15 Correct? 15 That is my recollection of buy buttons or a direct ability to buy a download, 16 16 That's correct. That's the only academic literature I could find that deals 17 17 18 with the topic. 18 Q Direct ability from where? 19 From the station. 19 Now in the next sentence, you say A 20 that there are important differences between 20 Do you know whether that ability 0 included the ability to purchase entire CDs? 21 terrestrial radio and webcasting that render 21 I don't believe so. I think this it less likely that terrestrial, I'm sorry, 22 22 Page 215 Page 217 that webcasting is promotional in terrestrial was the data on individual tracks. So to the 1 1 2 radio. Do you see that? 2 best of my recollection, it would be tracks, 3 3 I do. not CDs. A 4 4 Okay. Among the differences that Q So if a consumer wanted a CD, they you were referring to you include the fact had to go somewhere else. Correct? 6 that terrestrial radio have disc jockeys that 6 A That's correct. 7 promote or select particular music. Correct? 7 Now do you know when this buy button or this facility or this ability that 8 That would be one factor, yes. 8 9 9 you've testified to purchase tracts was first And in addition, it's your opinion 10 or your view that the listening experience of 10 made available by Bonneville? webcasting is closer to CD listening than the No. I do not. 11 11 A listening experience of terrestrial radio. 12 Do you know how the time when it 12 was made available relates to the four weeks 13 Correct? 13 14 in October of 2005? 14 Yes, closer and more likely to be A 15 I do not recall. 15 a substitute. Did you review Mr. Coryell's 16 Now on -- Let's see. You then 16 testimony about these particular data? 17 discuss buy buttons, I believe, on page 19 and 17 I'll be brief lest I cover ground that Mr. 18 I did. 18 A Do you recall him saying that this 19 Steinthal has covered. You would agree, would 19 Q was a new feature of those two websites? you not, that the buy button is not the only 20 20 21 way that a webcast listener can buy a 21 I do not recall that specifically 22 but it was available in October 2005. recording. Correct?

Page 220 Page 218 equivalents during 2005? Did you review the transcript of 1 1 0 2 2 I'd have to go back and check this oral testimony? that. As I said, it was higher. I also think 3 I believe I did, but I don't 3 A 4 that in terms of judging the absolute number 4 recall. 5 5 of CDs probably what's a better measure is to Q Let me ask you to turn to page 22 please. In the second full paragraph I 6 compare those to the responses of the average 6 7 7 believe you say that the average consumer in customer. So it is larger. The exact 8 the U.S. who is older than 10 buys only about 8 magnitude I can't say for sure. 9 9 three CDs a year. Is that your testimony? As you sit here, you don't 10 remember how many people subscribers to 10 A Yes. 11 And you derive that number by 11 digital music services costing \$4.99 or more Q looking at RIAA data for the total number of 12 in the NPD study bought in 2005? 12 13 CDs sold in 2005 and dividing it by the U.S. 13 A · How many CDs they bought? population? 14 How many CDs? 14 15 15 I do not recall at all. \mathbf{A} Above the age of 10, yes. 16 0 Now in the last sentence you say 16 (Off the record comments.) 17 "if the average consumer buys only three CDs 17 MR. JOSEPH: Let me see if I can a year an assumption that interactive services 18 refresh your recollection here with a document 18 19 19 substitute for two is highly conservative that was produced by Sound Exchange. 20 since it represents a very high percentage of 20 (Whereupon, the document total CD purchases." Are you in that sentence 21 21 referred to was marked 22 attempting to relate the number 2 to the 3.2 22 as Services Rebuttal Page 219 Page 221 CDs you derived from the RIAA population data? Exhibit No. 28 for 1 1 2 2 Yes. identification.) A 3 3 BY MR. JOSEPH: In making that statement, did you 4 Dr. Pelcovits, I've handed you a 4 perform any analysis to confirm that the 5 average number of CDs purchased by the 5 document that was produced to us by Sound 6 population that subscribes to interactive 6 Exchange with Bates numbers SXREB 003149 that 7 webcasting services would be the same as the 7 has been marked as Services Rebuttal Exhibit 8 average of the population as a whole but for 8 28. Is this data that you -- Well, let me ask 9 9 their subscription to interactive services? you to tell me what this is actually. 10 10 Well, there is certainly Okay. This does come from my 11 information on that in the NPD data and based 11 firm. It's dated that we prepared it and it 12 on that, there seems to be relatively 12 looks at as it says here customers who 13 subscribe to a digital music service and say 13 comparable not a significant different in CD 14 they pay \$4.99 or more and this would be -- my purchases across the population as a whole and 14 15 customers of webcast services. I don't recall 15 expectation is that these would be customers

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

16

17

18

19

20

21

large difference.

the exact relationship, but it was not a very

NPD data. In fact, according to the NPD data

digital music services costing more than \$4.99

purchase an average of more than 12.5 CD

that you rely on, didn't subscribers to

Interesting that you mention the

of on-demand, interactive services and this

gives the purchases or the customers' reports

on the purchases of CDs and other forms of

marked "Weighted Average Annual Number of

And are the numbers in the column

recorded music in two different periods,

essentially 2005 and 2004.

Page 222

1

2

3

7

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

Albums Purchased by an Individual" the number of either CDs or the equivalent of CDs based on downloads that were purchased by the individual?

Yes. I would say that the A individual self identified as what is purchased as work. That's correct.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

22

And by the way, it's true, is it not, that Group F which is this group that's being reflected here was defined by NPD as individuals who said they subscribed or listened to a digital music service or that they or someone in their household paid more than or equal to \$4.99 a month for that service? Correct?

A That's correct.

And that's what you took to be an interactive digital music service. Correct?

That's correct.

And by the way, the NPD study O showed that the average individual in the population purchased an average of almost six

Okay. Now on pages 23 and 24 of your testimony, you discuss -- Let me just see. Actually it's on pages 22 and 23 that

4 you discuss some data you receive from a 5 Liebowitz study on CD purchases. Do you see

6 that?

Yes, I do see that. A

8 Now the data you relied on didn't O 9 differentiate subscribers to interactive 10 webcasting services from other individuals, 11 did it?

A It did not and that's why I carried out the exercise I did to try to see how sensitive the CD purchases would be to different variables.

Now in fact the Liebowitz data didn't give you data on individuals at all. It gave you data on city aggregates. Right?

That's correct.

Did you analyze the data to determine the amount of music purchased by those who subscribe to interactive webcasting

Page 223

CDs or CD equivalent in 2005, didn't it?

The average across its whole population, I believe that's correct, ves.

Q

And I think it indicates people tend to overestimate how many CDs they buy. But that does not detract from the utility of looking at something like that to look at changes or relative purchases. So I think it's fair to say that based on these numbers subscribers to interactive music services, I would say probably buy twice as many CDs as the average person in the population. At least that's what I draw looking at the paper right now.

And you have your doubts about the Q accuracy of the numbers reported by individuals when they are self reporting CD purchases.

I have some doubts whether they accurately estimate how many they bought, the absolute number that they bought. Yes I do.

services?

I did not do that directly because it did not have information on subscribers to music services.

And Dr. Liebowitz had as his goal in the paper that you took this data -- Or the paper that he was working with these data of assessing the substitutional effect of file sharing on record sales, didn't he?

Yes, that's correct.

And in assessing the 12 substitutional effect of file sharing, Dr. 13 Liebowitz used internet access as a proxy for 14 file sharing, didn't he?

Yes. A

16 So in fact the people with 17 broadband access that analyzed were precisely the people that Dr. Liebowitz had theorized 18 would engage in the most substitutional file 19 sharing. Correct? 20

21 Well, that's the test that he was 22 trying to perform to see to what extent

Page 225

l 19 20 21

Page 226

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

greater internet access, greater penetration of internet access, would be correlated with declines in CD purchases.

- And given Mr. Liebowitz's data, did you do anything to remove the effect of file sharing from your analysis?
- Well, he did not have, as I said, file sharing directly in the study. So, no, I could not do that.
- 10 Did you -- Now on page 25, Dr. Pelcovits, you begin your discussion of the 12 data you received from NPD. Correct?
 - A · Yes.

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Now that survey that generated the Q data wasn't designed by NPD to compare music purchased by your benchmark market with music purchased by your target market, was it?
- That's correct. It was not designed. I was not involved in the design of the study and there was a broader purpose than the use I put it to.
 - Did you review the methodology

In fact, you didn't review any of NPD work papers or individual respondent responses, did you?

Yes, if we say work papers meaning something that takes the raw responses and derives the study results. I did not see that. They were not willing to provide me anything beyond the cross tab results that I've talked about earlier.

And you didn't receive any data from which you could analyze the amount of time spent listening to different kinds of music services, did you?

That's correct. I don't believe that was part of any of the questions in the survev.

Now in the first full paragraph, O second sentence of page 26, you say that the first group that you looked at consisted of subscribers to digital music services who claimed they are paying more than \$4.99 a month for the service. Correct?

Page 227

used by NPD to weight the data?

No. I did not.

Do you know whether NPD weighted the data to approximate the U.S. population of large or -- Well, first of all, do you know whether NPD weighted the data?

Yes, they weighted the raw responses to account for the fact that the respondents might not be representative of the population as a whole, so they, which is a very traditional approach, so they weighted those to try to build up and come up with an estimate that would be more representative of the population as a whole rather than the actual respondents to the questionnaire.

- Do you have anything in writing that describes the methodology used by NPD to weight the data?
- A I do not have that and I can say that in my request for additional information from NPD they were not willing to provide what they viewed as their proprietary methods.

Page 229

\mathbf{A} Yes.

And you assume they were the interactive service subscribers.

A Yes.

Q But I think as we've discussed the survey didn't ask whether anyone subscribed to interactive webcasting, did it?

They asked do you subscribe to a digital music service and then they gave a couple examples, but they did not define it as interactive as opposed to non-interactive.

And I believe you testified on direct that you excluded from the group of subscribers those who said they paid less than \$4.99 because they might have subscribed to a non-interactive service. Correct?

A Correct.

But you included the subscribers to an interactive service those who subscribed to some form of service but who didn't know how much they paid for their digital music service, didn't you?

1 I've just handed Services Rebuttal 1 \mathbf{A} I did. 2 So the group could have included 2 Exhibit 29, Dr. Pelcovits. This is your work 0 paper comparable to Services Rebuttal Exhibit individuals who weren't subscribing to 3 28, but this includes the groups A and B which 4 interactive services. Correct? 4 5 5 are the groups you actually did analyze. A It could have. I discussed this 6 with NPD in terms of looking at this as well 6 Correct? 7 7 as looking at just those that said they paid It's the -- That's correct. These 8 8 more than \$4.99 and they recommended are the groups that I presented in the presenting it this way although I also looked 9 testimony. at it the other way and that is even sort of 10 And those group had between them 10 109 who had subscribed for a year or less and 11 a stronger result. 11 You didn't present it the other 12 83 which subscribed for more than a year. 12 13 way. Correct? 13 Correct? That's correct. 14 Not in the testimony. I did as 14 A And I take it that if you subtract 15 you see in the work papers which I provided on 15 Q discovery. I did provide the results for the 100, I'm sorry, the 138 individuals in 16 16 17 what's called your Subgroup F. 17 Group F from the 192 individuals in Groups A Q · And in fact Subgroup F only had 77 18 18 and B you would come up with a number who individuals who said that they had subscribed didn't know how much they paid for their 19 19 20 within the last year. Correct? 20 subscription. Correct? 21 That's correct. 21 A A Yes, that's correct. 22 22 Q And 61 who said they had Q Now it's also true in your Page 231 Page 233 subscribed more than a year ago. Correct? analysis of those who subscribed, who you 1 1 2 2 construed as having subscribed to interactive A That's correct. 3 3 And -- Well we'll come back to services in Groups A and B, that you included 4 4 people who also listened to free webcasting. that actually. Now the number of individuals you analyzed which included those who said 5 5 Correct? 6 they paid more than \$4.99 and those who didn't 6 I'm sorry. I missed the question. A 7 know was a total of 192 individuals for the 7 It's true, is it not, that your 8 so-called interactive services. Is that 8 population of people that you deemed the 9 9 subscribers to interactive music services that correct? 10 10 you analyzed as parts of Groups A and B also A I don't recall the exact number. included or included individuals who listened 11 That seems about right. 11 And is it right that about 109 had 12 to free over-the-air webcasting? Correct? 12 been listening for a year or less and 83 had 13 Yes, listened to in that case both 13 14 been listening for a year or more? 14 the digital music paid for services as well as 15 That sounds about right. 15 free webcasting, yes. That's why there are MR. JOSEPH: Why don't we do 3145. 16 two groups here, A & B. 16 And in fact, Group B is the group 17 (Whereupon, the document 17 18 referred to was marked 18 of people who listened to the subscription 19 19 service costing either \$4.99 or more or some as Services Rebuttal 20 unknown number and also to free webcasting. Exhibit No. 29 for 20 21 identification.) 21 Correct? BY MR. JOSEPH: 22 22 A I hadn't -- I actually did not

Page 234 we have these groups right. Group A did recall whether it was A or B, but I'll take 1 2 2 vour word that it's B. listen to what you called the digital music 3 You don't have to take my word for 3 service but did not listen to free webcasting. it, sir. 4 4 Correct? 5 5 Okay. Yes, that's what's in the printout A A 6 0 Look at your document down where 6 here. I assume that's correct. Yes. So A is 7 it says in the notes, the fifth line of the 7 did not. 8 notes, where it says "Group A is defined..." 8 0 Did not. 9 and the seventh line "Group B is defined..." 9 A Did not. 10 10 And B is did. Thank you. O 11 Were those statements accurate 11 Q A Did. 12 descriptions of the group? 12 O Okay. The total population of 13 Yes. Absolutely. 13 Group A was 60 individuals. Correct? 14 So Group A was those who "listened I don't recall the number. 0 14 or subscripted to a digital music service and 15 15 (Whereupon, the document someone paid more than \$4.99 a month or they 16 16 referred to was marked 17 didn't know how much they paid and they 17 as Services Rebuttal subscribed or listened," I'm sorry, "and they 18 18 Exhibit No. 30 for listened to a music stream from a free website 19 19 identification.) 20 during the past 12 months." Correct? 20 BY MR. JOSEPH: 21 A Yes. 21 Dr. Pelcovits, I've handed you

Page 235

22

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

represent to you was produced by Sound

"didn't listen to music stream from the free website." Correct?

That's Group A. And Group B

No, Group B is they did listen to music from a free website.

Q I'm sorry.

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Q

 \mathbf{A} Group A they didn't listen to music from a free website.

Thank you, sir. I had that backwards. It was not intended as a trick question. Did you anything to control for the effect of listening to music on free webcasting in the group that you used as subscribers to an interactive service?

I did not have -- No, I did not do that although again looking at A and B separately if I recollect there was no big difference between the two.

In fact, the total number of people in Group A, those who listened to subscription services, a digital music service but didn't listen to music stream from a free -- Let me before I ask that question make sure 1 2 Exchange and I'm just going to ask if looking 3 at this document refreshes your recollection 4 about the total population in Group A. 5

Services Rebuttal Exhibit 30 which I will

Yes, it does. A

And that total population is 60. Q Correct?

> Yes, that's correct. A

And if you look down on the left column, it's true, is it not, that of those 60 only 24 individuals starting listening within the last year? Is that correct?

That's correct. That would be totaling up 9, 8 and 7. Yes.

Now it's true, is it not, that NPD told you that when they were analyzing data from this survey they looked for groups with at least 200 people in them and they said you should approach below that level with caution? Correct?

A Yes, that's what they said to me. We had quite a few discussions about that

Page 240 Page 238 1 In a statistical estimate, yes. 1 issue. 2 2 And neither you nor NPD performed 0 And in fact, they told you that a T-test on the results that you report in 3 before comparing groups with counts below 200 3 4 your testimony, did you? individuals you should use a T-test or some 4 5 5 A I did not because I did not have other statistical method. Correct? 6 the raw data. They would not even though I 6 They did say that along with in 7 7 general saying taking point estimates from a asked that they perform such tests. 8 smaller group was problematic. But we did So you weren't able to derive any 9 9 discuss this at length and in terms of getting confidence ranges in connection with the data 10 you report from the NPD study, were you? 10 a general comparison where the groups are 11 smaller to see whether effects are different 11 Not from a statistically 12 meaningful standpoint, that's correct. I from one group to another, they believe that 12 13 could not derive a T-test or a confidence 13 what I was doing was reasonable even though 14 14 the groups were less than 200. interval. 15 15 (Whereupon, the document In fact you didn't perform any 16 statistical analysis of the data, did you? 16 referred to was marked 17 A I did not perform any formal 17 as Services Rebuttal 18 18 statistical analysis. That does not in my Exhibit No. 31 for 19 19 opinion preclude using the data from the identification.) 20 20 BY MR. JOSEPH: survey and making certain judgments based on 21 21 Let me show you a document the data. 22 previously marked for identification for your 22 Q And you did not --Page 241 1 deposition as Rebuttal Deposition Exhibit 3. 1 JUDGE ROBERTS: Dr. Pelcovits, why 2 2 Dr. Pelcovits, do you recognize this document? wouldn't they perform that kind of analysis? 3 3 A I do. THE WITNESS: I believe they were 4 4 Q very reluctant to get into a situation where This was an email sent to you by 5 5 NPD. Correct? what they believed were their survey techniques and statistical techniques would 6 Yes, that's an email we provided 6 7 7 end up getting revealed publicly. They regard in discovery. 8 8 this as sort of a very significant trade And in the last of three bullets 9 9 it tells you that they typically look for at secret of theirs and they felt that if they 10 least a 200 raw base count and counts below 10 were to do these tests and essentially get 11

that level should be used directionally and with some degree of caution. Correct?

A Yes.

Q And for comparing groups which is what you've described, they say "utilizing a T-test would provide a confidence range for the observed differences between the various groups." Correct?

A That's correct.

Q Now a T-test is a statistical measure of the significance or confidence in

the statistic. Correct?

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

their methodology dragged into the proceeding 11 12 as I think the way they put it, they thought 13 this could expose them to that risk. 14 JUDGE ROBERTS: Thank you. 15 CROSS EXAMINATION (Cont'd.) 16 BY MR. JOSEPH: Q You didn't perform any 17 18 quantitative measure of the variability of the 19 data or the samples responses, did you? 20 I did not perform any statistical 21 tests but I had the responses that we see in 22 the exhibit that you just showed me, Services

Page 242 Rebuttal Exhibit 30 and I was able to just generally get a feel for and an understanding of the data and I was able to see whether

there was any evidence that was contrary to the conclusion that I was trying to draw.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

You didn't perform any quantitative measure of the variability of the data, did you?

That's correct. I did not have the information necessary to do that.

Now let me ask you to turn please to page 26 of your written rebuttal testimony. Actually, you're already there and you say in the last paragraph that "neither listening to music stream from a free website nor subscribing to an interactive music service had an effect on the purchases of recorded music." Do you see that?

Yes, I followed that up. It does have an effect, but I say the effect is not significant enough to undermine my sensitivity analysis.

1 with respect to the subscribers and it's true,

- 2 is it not, that Group A is defined as
- 3 individuals who said they subscribed or
- listened and they or someone in their 4
- 5 household paid more than \$4.99 a month.
- 6 Correct?

7

8

9

10

11

21

22

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

That's correct, but I would have A to go back to the questionnaire to see exactly how that was established.

As you sit here, you don't recall.

I don't recall.

12 MR. JOSEPH: Why don't we show you the questionnaire? Exhibit 6. I'm sorry. 13 14 That was Deposition Exhibit 6, Your Honor. 15 Lest there be confusion in the record, we'll

have a formal rebuttal exhibit number. 16

17 (Whereupon, the document referred to was marked 18 19 as Services Rebuttal 20 Exhibit No. 32 for

identification.) BY MR. JOSEPH:

Page 243

And you spoke in the last sentence of new subscribers to the digital music service. Correct? I'm sorry. The next to the last sentence.

I'm sorry. The next -- New subscribers, yes. That's referring to the subscribers during 2005.

You define those as individuals who had listened or subscribed for under a year. Correct?

Yes, I believe the question they respond to is how long ago did you subscribe to the music service.

Well, actually, the data didn't differentiate between the subscriber and somebody who listened, did it?

I believe that what they provided me with is those that listen and subscribe, but the question is how long have you subscribed.

Why don't you take a look back at Exhibit 29 where Groups A and B are defined

Page 245 Now I've just handed you, Dr.

Pelcovits, Services Rebuttal Exhibit 32. Do you recognize that?

I do. I believe that the questionnaire used by NPD.

And it's true, is it not, that it asked in Question 2 whether you subscribed or listened to a digital music service? Correct?

I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?

It asks in the second question whether the respondent had subscribed or listened to a digital music service. Correct?

It asks it in that question but then there are other questions where it just asked about where you subscribe to the service and I know there was some back and forth on this issue with them because when they gave me

18 the results for the population as a whole, it

19 seemed to indicate a larger number of

20 respondents who were using a digital music

21 service than were in Groups A and B and I

22 asked them why that was true and they said

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Page 246 because there were some customers who said 2 they listened to it but don't subscribe to it 3 and they excluded those. So that's the source of some confusion here but certainly in terms 5 of differentiating what I would consider to be 6 the newer from the older customers that's 7 based on a response to the question at the 8 bottom of the first page here which is "When

was the first time that you..." and then if 9 10 you turn to the next page, the third question

would be "subscribed to a digital music 11

12 service" and the same thing "streamed music 13 from a free website." That's clearly not a 14 subscription issue. So that's why I'm trying 15 to make sure we're not getting the wrong

16 impression about these respondents. 17

Is it your understanding that the data only included the actual subscribers or are you unsure whether the data included also people who listened but weren't the actual subscribers?

 \mathbf{A} I'm pretty sure it includes just

months prior to the survey. Correct? 1

Actually it's seven to twelve months, but, yes, that's correct.

Okay. In fact, isn't it true that as of the 109 people that you counted as new subscribers 74 had subscribed within the prior six months, in other words, the last half of 2005?

I would have to check that but it sounds in the right range.

If it would assist, would it refresh your recollection or assist you if you look at the third page of Services Rebuttal Exhibit 30 on Bates page 3109? Could you not get it by looking, if you see on that page the second time 212 shows up on the raw base?

A Yes, I do.

Is it your understanding that the way these spreadsheet worked, and unfortunately they were produced in a difficult form to use, that that number would represent, would be comparable, on the first

Page 247

the subscribers.

18

19 20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

16

17

18

19

20

21

In any event you describe the new subscribers as with respect to the interactive services with respect to what you called the digital music services as those who had listened for under a year. Correct?

For those who answered the question "When was the first time you subscribed to a digital music service" is those who for the first time subscribed within the previous 12 months, right.

12 And it included those who had 13 subscribed or indicated that they subscribed 14 within zero to three months prior to the 15 survey. Correct?

A That's correct.

And it included those who indicated they subscribed three to six months prior to the survey. Correct?

\mathbf{A} That's correct.

And it included those who indicated that they subscribed six to twelve

1 page of the exhibit to total subscribers to a 2 digital music service whereas the first page 3 deals with Group A, the second page deals with 4 Groups A and B?

Yes, that's the way the spreadsheet would run.

So that the first two numbers, the 32, would be those who had subscribed within the past three months and the 42 would be those who had subscribed within three to six months. Correct?

Correct.

So 74 had subscribed within the prior six months. Correct?

A Yes.

So your count of CD purchases by what you refer to as new subscribers included at least six months and possibly for some as many as almost 12 months when those 74 individuals were not subscribers. Correct?

Yes, they include a period of time when they are not subscribers. Yes.

Page 250 Page 252 And at least for those 74 that 1 A That's also correct. 1 2 0 And at least with respect to the period of time was at least half the year and likely more. Correct? 3 38 who had been subscribers for more than two 4 years, during both 2004 and 2005, they were 4 That's correct. 5 subscribers to digital music services. 5 0 And even the remaining group that you considered new subscribers, the 35 who 6 Correct? 6 said they subscribed between seven and twelve 7 7 \mathbf{A} Yes, but that's -- If we go back months ago, could have subscribed at any time 8 to my testimony, that's not what I was trying during the first six months of the period. 9 to test. I was trying to see whether there 10 Correct? 10 was a trend over time of subscribers to the 11 services of buying fewer CDs. 11 That's correct. A 12 Q Now your group of those who had 12 Sir, I just asked a simple question. Had they been subscribers during subscribed for one year or more included 13 13 2004 and 2005 and the answer is yes. Right? individuals who had subscribed for two years 14 14 or more. Correct? 15 The answer is yes for those 15 A 16 customers. 16 Α That's correct. 17 17 Q And in fact in the group you O Now let's talk about the group 18 described as subscribers who interacted 18 that listened to free webcasting. Do you digital music services, Groups A and B, you 19 recall that there was a total of 423 who 19 started listening within the past year? 20 identified 38 as having subscribed for a year 20 21 21 or more. Right? I don't recall the exact number, 22 22 Which group are we talking about? no. Page 251 Page 253 A and B. 1 Why don't we see if there are 1 Q other pages from the spreadsheet that will 2 A A and B. 3 3 Your group of interactive digital refresh your recollection. music subscribers. 4 4 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: While you're 5 5 marking those, we'll recess another five And I'm trying to recall the number here you're saying of the greater than 6 6 minutes. Off the record. 7 7 a year ago is for A and B, I believe, is 83. (Whereupon, at 4:24 p.m., the 8 8 above-entitled matter recessed and reconvened Q That's correct. 9 9 Okay. I thought you just said -at 4:31 p.m.) \mathbf{A} 10 Q Was it 83, sir? 10 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: On the 11 Yes, I think you just said a 11 A record. different number. 12 MR. JOSEPH: Thank you, Your 12 13 Well, at least of those 83, 38 had 13 Honor. I believe the last question had been subscribed for more than two years. Correct? 14 how many of the group listening to free 14 15 webcasting had started within the last year. 15 I could check that in a minute. You're welcome to. 16 Well, let me --16 Q 17 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Yes. 17 Okay. That's correct. A So that only 45 listeners had 18 MR. JOSEPH: We're missing an 18 19 essential participant. 19 subscribed during 2004. Correct? 20 PARTICIPANT: I apologize. 20 That's correct. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: We're beyond 21 And you don't know when in 2004 21 our five minutes. 22 they subscribed. Correct?

Page 256 Page 254 within the six months before the survey was PARTICIPANT: I'll go sit over 1 1 2 there. 2 taken? 3 Correct. Sum of 217 and 102. 3 (Off the record comments.) \mathbf{A} CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Let's 4 Correct. 4 5 5 proceed, Mr. Joseph. 0 And that would be 319 out of the total that you defined as new listeners of 6 (Off the record comments.) 6 7 MR. JOSEPH: Let me hand out this 7 423. Correct? It would be 319 plus 104. 8 exhibit. 8 Excuse me. Yes, that's correct. A 9 (Whereupon, the document 9 And so there were only 104 10 referred to was marked listeners to music from a free website that 10 11 as Services Rebuttal 11 you were confident listened for at least six 12 Exhibit No. 33 for 12 months to music from free websites in 2005. 13 identification.) 13 Correct? 14 By MR. JOSEPH: 14 A That's correct. Only 104 that had 15 listened to it for six months or longer, yes. 15 O Dr. Pelcovits, do you recall that Group C was the group defined as the group And for the other 319, for more 16 16 17 that listened to free webcasting? 17 than half of the time in 2005, they were not listening to music from a free website. 18 That's correct. It's defined as 18 19 19 Correct? those who listened to free webcasting and did 20 not subscribe to a digital music service. 20 A Correct. 21 Now looking at page 3114, I'm 21 And even with respect to those 104 22 sorry. I've handed just for the record 22 listeners, you don't know for how long in 2005 Page 255 Page 257 Services Rebuttal Exhibit 33 which also or for what part of 2005 they were listening 2 consists of pages from the spreadsheet 2 to music from a free website. Correct? relating to Group C produced by Sound 3 3 A Other than that it was more than 4 Exchange. Is this a document that you 4 six months. 5 recognize? 5 Or that they started more than six 6 A Yes, this would be comparable for months before the taking of the survey. 7 what we went through before for Group A and A 7 Correct? 8 8 and B combined. I don't know if we're disagreeing 9 And with respect to Group C to here or what. They had, these subscribers 10 determine how long a respondent to the survey 10 had, been subscribers for at least six months. had streamed music from a free website you 11 11 I guess - Are we saying the same thing? 12 would look at the last cluster on numbers on 12 Well, these aren't identified as page 3114, correct, starting of the 1152 which 13 13 14 is the base of stream from a free website? 14 Yes. You're absolutely right. 15 15 I'm sorry for the confusion. That's correct. They had been screening for somewhere between 16 Q And so your population for the last that subscribed during 2005 would be the 17 seven and twelve months. 17 18 sum of 217, 102 and 104. Correct? 18 All we know was that at least 19 Yes. 19 according to the questionnaire if you refer A -20 And it's true, is it not, that 20 back to Rebuttal Exhibit 32 that the first 21 those numbers mean that 319 of those listeners 21 time they started listening to music from a started streaming music from a free website free website was between seven and twelve

Page 258 Page 260 months before the survey was taken. Correct? MR. JOSEPH: Thirty-two, the 1 1 2 2 questionnaire. Yes. 3 Now with reference to Exhibit 33, 3 MR. HANDZO: No objection. 0 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Without would you agree that there were 604 people who 4 5 started listening to music from free websites objection, Exhibit 32 is admitted. 5 6 at least a year before the survey was taken? 6 (The document referred ·₇ 7 Maybe I'm not getting the question to having been 8 right. These are those that would have 8 previously marked for 9 identification as 9 subscribed or listened ---10 Started listening more than a year 10 Services Rebuttal 11 before the survey was taken. 11 Exhibit No. 32, was 12 More than a year. So that would 12 received in evidence.) be anyone other than the first three groups By MR. JOSEPH: 13 13 Now I believe earlier on direct 14 14 here. 15 Not counting the last group which 15 when you were talking about how you knew Q was don't know. Correct? streamed music from a free website meant a 16 16 Right. So it would be sum of 182, 17 17 non-interactive service that is of the kind at 171, 158 and 93 and -- · 18 18 issue in this proceeding, I believe you said 19 Okay. You can add them if you'd 19 that a powerful reason was the list of Q 20 20 examples given after the words "streamed music like. 21 21 from a free website." Do you remember A No, that's fine. 22 22 The record will reflect it. testifying to that effect? Q Page 259 Page 261 1 What was the number you gave me? 1 \mathbf{A} I do. I can accept that. 2 2 Why was that a powerful reason? 3 3 Q I said 604. It was at least in my view a way 4 4 A That looks right. of trying to understand what the customer was 5 0 And of those 604, all but 182 had 5 responding to, I'm sorry, what the respondent 6 6 been listening, who had started listening to was saying yes to and the fact that some of 7 7 free websites more than two years before the these examples are given and these are to the 8 8 survey was taken. Correct? extent they are free would be compliant 9 9 services that this is good evidence of that. That's correct. A 10 10 And with respect to the 182 that You would expect the respondents to the survey to understand the meaning of the started between one and two years ago, you 11 11 don't know when during that one year period 12 survey in light of the examples given, 12 wouldn't you? 13 they actually started. Correct? 13 14 It would help give meaning to the 14 That's correct. A 15 15 Now let me ask you to turn back to questions, ves. 16 In fact, you thought it would give Services Rebuttal Exhibit 32 which is the 16 powerful help in interpreting the questions. questionnaire. Have it? 17 17 I have it. Thanks. 18 Correct. 18 19 I believe it does. 19 MR. JOSEPH: Your Honor, at this A 20 time I would like to offer Services Rebuttal O Now it's true, is it not, that 20 21 Exhibit 32. 21 nothing on this survey expressly asks about listening to simulcasts of terrestrial radio 22 22 MR. HANDZO: I'm sorry. Thirty?

Page 262

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

10

11

12

13

transmissions? Isn't it?

1

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

A That's correct.

Q And in fact, the examples that provide a powerful indication of the meaning of streamed music from a free website don't include radio station simulcast, do they?

A That's correct. They do not include simulcast radio stations.

Q So a person taking this survey would have to decide for themselves whether streamed music from a free website included listening to a radio station simulcast.

Correct?

A Correct.

Q Did you do any analysis of how persons taking the survey treated radio station simulcasts?

A I had no information on that and conducted no analysis on that.

Q In addition another item on the list was listen to terrestrial radio. Do you see that?

months before the last 12 months were rotated or where they always presented in the order shown here?

A I believe this is the order they were asked in and my basis for that is where they alter the order they seem to indicate that. For example on the second page there's an indication of a randomized which would imply that they randomized what order they asked those questions.

Q So the person to your understanding was always asked what they purchased in the last 12 months, in other words, 2005 before they were asked what they purchased in 2004. Correct?

A That's correct.

Q Now do you have an understanding of what determined outlier means?

A A general understanding of what it means, yes.

Q And what's your general understanding of what it means?

Page 263

A Yes.

Q And in preparing your testimony, you didn't perform any analysis of the response "listen to terrestrial radio," did you?

A I did not.

Q Now to get the numbers of purchases that you reported or that you used from this survey, the respondent had to give an answer in December 2005, first of all, how much they bought in 2005. Correct?

A That's correct.

Q And then they had to give an answer for how many they bought in the 12 months before 2005. Correct?

A That's correct.

Q And all of those answers were given in December of 2005. Correct?

A That's correct.

Q By the way, do you happen to know whether the questions relating to purchases in the last 12 months and purchases in the 12

Page 265

1 Well, my familiarity would be mostly that in econometrics if you are an 3 analysis of data and you have a pool of data 4 and you're trying to understand what explained 5 the data if there is some data that seems very 6 far off the mark and can't be explained in other ways, there might be reason to believe 8 it essentially should be removed or not really 9 explainable through the regression.

Q Do you have an understanding of the term in the context of surveys?

A I've not seen the term used in surveys, no.

14 Q You've not seen it with reference 15 to a respondent that gives an answer that 16 significantly deviates from the main?

17 A I've not seen that and I don't 18 know specifically how NPD would handle what 19 might appear to be an outlier. It's obviously 20 something that they I would expect would pay 21 attention to in the course of conducting their 22 analysis.

Page 268 Page 266 somebody who bought fewer than 29 or 25 CDs. And especially where the sample is 1 1 2 Again, I don't have the raw data. small, is it not true that an outlier will increase the variability of the survey and 3 I have what they report based on their techniques that they use in the normal course 4 decrease the confidence that you have in the 4 5 of their business and this is the data they 5 survey? 6 6 gave me and this is what I relied on. A Everything else being equal, yes. ·7 JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: What type of 7 And do you see another individual 8 who said that he or she purchased 25.9 CDs in distribution, Mr. Joseph? 8 9 9 MR. JOSEPH: My question wasn't 2005? 10 dependent on a type of distribution, Your 10 \mathbf{A} Yes, I do. By the way, did you notice that 11 11 Honor. 12 JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: It wasn't. 12 the person who said he or she bought 25 CDs in 2005 also said he or she bought exactly 25 CDs 13 13 Okay. in 2004? You won't find it on these sheets. 14 By MR. JOSEPH: 14 15 Now, Dr. Pelcovits, did you do 15 A But that would not surprise me. anything to adjust the data that you were 16 No. 16 17 Do you remember noticing that? given from NPD for outliers or apparent Q 17 18 I don't recall that, no. 18 outliers? A 19 19 Do you remember noticing the \mathbf{A} I did not. Let's look at your data for Group 20 person who he or she bought 25.9 CDs in 2005 20 0 A for a second which is Services Rebuttal 21 also said he or she bought exactly 25.9 CDs in 21 22 2004? 22 Exhibit 30. Do you see there on about halfway Page 269 1 down the first page under "Bought music three 1 A I don't recall that. to five years ago," a single individual who 2 2 Would you have looked for reported 25 CD purchases in 2005? 3 3 something like that? 4 4 À Yes. Not necessarily, no. I was given 5 And do you see another on the next 5 this data by NPD. There was a limited amount page who reported purchasing 25.9 CDs in 2005? 6 of analysis I could do with it. That's what 6 7 7 Yes, I see that. I did. That's what I provided. I looked at 8 How do you get 25.9 in what should 8 the data in different possible groupings to be average number of full length CDs for a 9 see whether there was any tendency in the data single purchasers? 10 10 here that I was overlooking and did not find 11 11 that to be the case. In other words, the I would assume that's a reflection 12 results I report are the basic story told by 12 of some of the weighting that they do. So 13 there might have been a respondent and because 13 the data. They are not something that I 14 created and generate through some significant 14 that respondent was less than fully 15 adjustments or exclusion of data. 15 representative of something in the population MR. JOSEPH: Let's do this one as that that's the adjustment that takes place. 16 16 17 -- What are we up to now? Thirty-two? But I don't know how they calculated these. 17 PARTICIPANT: Thirty-four. 18 Sure. You don't know where that 18 (Whereupon, the document 19 number came from. 19 20 referred to was marked 20 I don't know exactly how they came

> 21 22

21

22

up with it, no.

So it's possible that it was

as Services Rebuttal

Exhibit No. 34 for

Page 272 Page 270 identification.) 1 previous 12 months and to the extent it's very 1 2 BY MR. JOSEPH: 2 helpful because it would seem that the 3 customer would answer by relating one year to 3 Dr. Pelcovits, just quickly to see 4 the other and to the extent that that customer if this refreshes your recollection. I've 4 5 5 for example had substituted away from CD handed you Services Rebuttal Exhibit 34 which are pages SX REV 3099 and 3100 which purport purchases you would expect that same customer 6 6 7 to be Group A material, Group A responses, 7 would recognize that he was buying 8 coming from the NPD spreadsheet. Is that 8 significantly fewer CDs now than before. 9 accurate? 9 MR. JOSEPH: Move to strike, Your 10 Honor. The question was did you do anything 10 A Yes. 11 Q Do you see that the person -- And 11 to test for the possibility that the answer would be influenced. I think that admits a 12 Exhibit 34 where you see it says "Twelve 12 months prior," questions 3B and 3D, that would 13 13 very simple yes or no. 14 be for answers for 2004. Correct? 14 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: I would not 15 15 respond to that question with a yes or no. Correct. \mathbf{A} Overruled or denied. 16 O And Exhibit 30 which we started 16 17 with reflects questions 3A and 3C, that would 17 BY MR. JOSEPH: 18 be 2005. Correct? 18 Now, Dr. Pelcovits, if you turn 19 back to Services Rebuttal Exhibit 32, the 19 That's correct. A 20 And you see where you have an 20 questionnaire, did each respondent answer with individual who claimed to have, in the group 21 respect to all of these activities, bought a 21 22 of 60, bought music downloads three to five 22 commercially released CD, downloaded music Page 271 years ago. There was one such individual and 1 1 from a free file sharing service, bought music 2 that same individual purchased 25 full length 2 from a digital music store, subscribed or 3 CDs in 2005 and 25 full length CDs in 2006. 3 listened to a digital music service, etc.? 4 Correct? 4 I'm sorry. Your question was did 5 5 A Yes. each person respond to each question. 6 Q And do you see on the next page 6 Yes sir. 7 the person who bought or owned a portable 7 They were asked each question. I 8 digital music player for five years or longer 8 don't know what happens if a customer skips 9 and in both 2004 and 2005 purchased 25.9 CDs? 9 over a question. 10 Correct? 10 But they either answer it or have the opportunity to answer each question is 11 A Yes, I see that. 11 12 Did you do anything to test the 12 your understanding. accuracy of individual recall of how much 13 13 That's my understanding, yes. A 14 music a person purchased between 13 and 24 14 Did you do anything to control 15 months ago? 15 your results for the other activities that 16 I did not do such a test. were asked about including free downloads, A 16 17 Did you do anything to test for 17 purchased downloads, ownership of a portable the possibility that the answer for 13 to 24 18 18 digital music player, listening to satellite months ago would be influenced by the radio? 19 19 20 immediately preceding answer? 20 When you use the term "to control A 21 I would think that they would 21 for" what do you have in mind?

22

Did you perform any analysis that

indeed be affected by what they said about the

Page 274 used the responses to those questions? 1 this ring tone that includes both rights. 1 2 2 No. In other words, the sound 3 O Dr. Pelcovits, on page 28 in the 3 recording owners acquire the musical works 4 last paragraph, you say that "evidence in the right. market shows that record companies regularly 5 \mathbf{A} Yes. 6 receive percentages of revenue that are a 6 Q Now you were also asked some 7 questions by Mr. Steinthal about your 7 certain percentage or even higher." It's true, is it not, that that sentence refers 8 testimony on page 3 that musical works can be 8 9 9 only to music videos and master tones? viewed as an input to the sound recording sold 10 Correct? 10 to consumers. Do you recall that? 11 I do. 11 A Yes. I believe you mean master 12 12 ring tones. Yes. O And does the fact that sound recording owners may buy the rights to the 13 MR. JOSEPH: Can I have a moment, 13 Your Honor? 14 musical works so that they can sell a bundled 14 product, is that relevant to your testimony 15 (Pause.) 15 MR. JOSEPH: Your Honor, I have no about it being an input? 16 16 17 17 Well, it's certainly an example further questions. where that takes place explicitly. I believe CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Are there 18 18 that it's fair to characterize musical works 19 questions from NPR? 19 20 MR. TAYLOR: No, Your Honor. 20 as an input from a more general sense of 21 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Handzo. 21 recognizing how the services and goods are 22 22 MR. HANDZO: Thank you, Your sold in the marketplace. Page 275 1 Honor. 1 And does scenario where the owners 2 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 2 of the sound recording purchased the musical 3 3 work right, does that have any impact on your BY MR. HANDZO: 4 4 opinion about how this market would function Dr. Pelcovits, when you were 5 5

in the future if the owners of the musical

work were holding for a higher price?

7 Well, it is certainly an example 8 of a contractual arrangement that particularly 9 if it were entered into at the time the sound 10 recording was made, it would be a way to get around any problem of what we call "hold-up" 11 12 where the musical work copyright holder would 13 prevent anything from going forward unless 14 they were to get the same payment as the sound 15 recording copyright holder.

- Now switching to your testimony about NPD.
- \mathbf{A} Yes.

6

16

17

18 19 You indicated in response to one 20 of Mr. Joseph's questions that in the survey or with surveys generally you may have some 21 22 concerns about the absolute numbers of

- questioned by Mr. Steinthal, you were asked some questions about whether in the ring tone markets the sound recording owners sometimes pay the musical works fee. Do you recall that?
 - \mathbf{A} Yes.

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

- And then I believe your answer was that sometimes they do.
 - That was my answer. A
- 14 Q And do you know how that came 15 about?
 - \mathbf{A} I understand that came about through agreements between the record companies and the music publishers.
 - Q And what did those agreements involve?
 - \mathbf{A} They involved securing the musical work right for purposes of being able to sell

Page 281

Page 278

1

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

purchases that consumers report having made.

2 Do you recall that?

1

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

11 12

13

19

20

21

Yes. \mathbf{A}

O Does that affect your view about whether it's appropriate to look at those numbers to see relative changes over time?

No and I think if I reflect back to something I said in my direct testimony, I did say that I thought consumers were not particularly good at knowing or identifying how much they bought of something. But I think the reason this survey is particularly useful is because it asks the same person what did you buy this year versus what did you buy last year. And although the customer might not get it exactly right and might in fact overstate the amount of CDs he bought in 2005 I do believe that it is reasonable to think that the customer when he says I bought the same number in 2004 or something very close that we're seeing evidence of whether or not

results. In other words, if you break this down within my ability to do so, you tend to

2 3 get the same types of results which is looking

4 at it through one way or another way,

5 breaking it down one way or another way.

6 There is no evidence of any significant

7 difference in substitution from one group of 8 customers who used webcasting and those that 9

used digital music service. 10

Would the same be true for example with looking at people who only used a digital music service versus people who used both the digital music service and a free webcasting service?

A I believe that's true, although I think quite frankly it really doesn't matter because we're looking at the effect of using digital music service and whether that or not that leads to substitution and if there is a substitution effect that should be taken account of in the way I did my benchmarking analysis, it doesn't matter whether those

Page 279

webcasting or use of an on-demand music

service.

3 Now you were also asked some 4 questions I think about whether the results

there is an effect of something like

5 that you report in your testimony for

6 interactive webcasters included people who 7

said they didn't know how much they paid. Do

you recall that?

9 A Yes, I do. 10

Did you look separately at a group of people who knew how much they paid and paid more than \$4.99 a month?

A I did.

And based on your looking at that 14 15 group separately, did you see any reason to believe that your numbers were being biased by 16 17 the fact that you included people who said 18 they didn't know?

No and I think we already have discussed that. The Group F were those that knew and said how much they paid and they paid more than \$4.99 and it shows the same type of

customers are also using a free webcasting service.

3 MR. HANDZO: Thank you. That's 4 all I have.

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr.

6 Steinthal.

> RECROSS EXAMINATION MR. STEINTHAL: Just one thing. RECROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. STEINTHAL:

Just one thing, Dr. Pelcovits. You were just asked about the hypothetical of the publisher hold-ups being taken care by including it in the price all in for musical good. Right?

A Yes.

There's really no concern about 0 publishers holding up whether it be record companies or music distribution companies when their rates are subject to either a compulsory license on the one hand or rate court constraint on the other, is there?

Page 282

I can't say that that's true. I think that the fact that the agreements in Dr. Jaffe's example of his market and his whole theory is itself based on some concept of holdup and I'm saying that the holdup concept can be gotten around through a contract such as the ones I refer to earlier.

Are you saying Dr. Jaffe's theory is based on a holdup concept?

Absolutely.

MR. STEINTHAL: I have no further questions.

13 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Joseph. 14 MR. JOSEPH: May I have a moment,

Your Honor? I'm thinking about one of his 15 16 answers.

17 (Pause.)

MR. JOSEPH: No further questions, 18

19 Your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

20

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Mr. Handover, do you have anything further?

22 MR. HANDZO: No, Your Honor. 1 focus on here?

> 2 THE WITNESS: I think we are 3 looking and should look at this from on 4 balance a more long run approach and

5 particularly it should be looking at if we

6 were talking about this as an actual market 7

the nature of the arrangements that the 8

parties would enter into for something going

9 forward, for something which was not

constrained by some prior agreements such as 10

11 the whole issue of as we've been talking about

the publishing right being a separate right. 12

13 I think it should look at the market from a

14 broader sense than that and how the market,

15 what are the marketplace forces, what would

16 you expect in a market to be negotiated given

17 enough flexibility and fluidity in the market

18 and taking into consideration by the record

19 companies of future sound recordings of where

20 they would have the flexibility and how to go

21 about making those and where the copyrights

22 would be granted and given in the types of

Page 283

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Any questions from the bench?

JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Perhaps just one. Dr. Pelcovits, we've been talking a lot in this proceeding about "market rates" and the like and been offered a number of suggestions as to how those markets ought to be constructed and how we ought to look at them and so on and so forth. We haven't had much said about the time period, however, which we ought to be looking at with respect to those markets. Do you have any thoughts about that?

THE WITNESS: I have to make sure I have the right reference for the question, Your Honor. Could you give me a little more there?

JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Basically, what I'm trying to get at here is are we looking at a short term analysis of the markets or are we looking at a long term market equilibrium price? What is it we're really trying to

contractual arrangements that could be entered into.

JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: So more of a dynamic analysis than a steady one.

THE WITNESS: I think that's right. Markets are very dynamic and I think you can't just -- If you take a snapshot, you very often are influenced by the arrangements and the prices that have developed in response to particular institutional structures. But if we're looking at how markets actually work over time, they tend to work themselves around various institutional considerations.

JUDGE WISNIEWSKI: Thank you. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Any questions?

JUDGE ROBERTS: Yes. Dr. Pelcovits, if you could turn to the last paragraph on page 2 of your testimony. Here you're talking about Dr. Jaffe's testimony and his assertion that essentially webcasting revenues are economically irrelevant and

Page 286

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

5

6

7

8

9

therefore should be treated so in the 2 marketplace. Your assertion is that going to 3 the top of page 3 that that is not true. "A 4 rational business will consider each 5 opportunity to increase revenues to cover a 6 portion of its costs as worthwhile in its own 7 right." Is this a discussion on your part 8 about market segmentation?

9

10

11

14

15

16

17 18

19 20

21

22

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

THE WITNESS: No, it's not intended to be that. It's simply trying to respond to a claim by Dr. Jaffe where he says 12 that a market's very small and therefore you don't have to be concerned about how much of 13 your cost you're recovering there. It happens that they are segmented this way, but in fact all that means is that you're going to try to maximize your profits in each segment individually or to the extent to which there is some crossover effect or substitution from one to the other.

JUDGE ROBERTS: So if there is a small sliver of the pie, so to speak, to be

Page 288 1 different markups if they are really segmented

2 and if demand conditions are different in the

3 two markets. But each market in its own right

4 it's still important and it's still one where

you would expect the normal marketplace

6 forces, namely essentially all the dynamics we

7 were talking about to still play a role.

JUDGE ROBERTS: And from the seller's perspective the seller would move or take necessary action to again as you point out to maximize that. What kind of considerations would go into the seller's evaluation of these so-called smaller markets? Would they adjust price to recover that amount or how would they do that?

THE WITNESS: I think they certainly sort of a starting would look to all the markets to recover a certain portion of their costs of development and certainly any distribution costs and there would be no fundamental difference from how they would approach a small or large market just because

Page 287

recovered you say that a rational decision maker in a business would seek to move to recover that portion. Correct?

THE WITNESS: Or seek to recover what it could from that portion. It's not going to underprice it simply because it's not a big market. If that were true, then you would expect a record company to be, let's say, indifferent with how much CDs sell for in Montana because it's a small state. But obviously they would be.

JUDGE ROBERTS: Just in the example that you used with respect to Montana, I would suspect that the cost of the CD in Montana is not as much as the cost of a CD in New York City necessarily.

THE WITNESS: Well, I would -- I don't know if that's true. It might be true because of retailing costs, although now with internet shopping it probably doesn't matter at all. But I would have to agree that in different markets you're going to get

Page 289

one market is small and the other one is

2 large. In some sense to say that the

3 webcasting is the sort of market that doesn't

4 matter because it's never going to tip a

decision one way or the other, you could say that about every single sale.

So I think each market is

important. Each market is one where the

seller as a business would consider what it

10 costs, what's gone into the product and try to

recover as much as it can subject to the 11

demand for the product in the market and where 12

13 you would expect to see a different cost

14 recovery or a different revenue recovery would

be based on differences and substitutes and 15

16

those two markets demand elasticities and

factors like that.

17 18 JUDGE ROBERTS: We've heard some 19 testimony in this proceeding about at least 20 offering by certain services, broadcasters in 21 particular, that their webcasting amounts to 22 very, very few people in actually streaming

Page 293

Page 290

music, but if I hear correctly you say that a rational seller would nevertheless move to try to capture or do what they could to try to capture that sliver even though it's very few people receiving the service.

2

3

4

5

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

6 THE WITNESS: I think they still 7 would. It's still a substantial amount of 8 money. The webcasting, even under current 9 rates, the webcast payments to Sound Exchange 10 are millions of dollars and in every expectation that's going to grow. So they are 11 12 certainly worth the attention of the 13 businessmen. I think businessmen make 14 decisions where they consider something of 15 several million dollars worth attention. The 16 only case where you would say it doesn't 17 matter would be whether the time and attention 18 necessary to deal with it are not sort of paid 19 for by the revenues in that market. It's such 20 a small, small market that it's not even worth 21 spending ten hours of someone's time on it.

Page 292 unfortunately or fortunately my colleague, Meg 1

2 Ryan, has received an appointment and is not

3 available to assist. So Mr. Kirby will be

filling and helping me. We have filed that 4

5 notice of appearance for Mr. Kirby. He will not be here tomorrow, but he will be here on 6

Wednesday. 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

1 2

3

4

5

6

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: I think parties would reasonablely expect the Court will take a careful approach new attorneys coming on who are not familiar with our proceedings and to the extent that they will be able to participate.

MR. STEINTHAL: Your Honor, Mr. Rosenstein came in during the rebuttal phase and did some of the discovery. So she is familiar with the case. Of course, she hasn't appeared here before but in particular because of my travel back and forth, I thought it was important to get another partner in my firm available. So she is familiar with the case and I have briefed her on the surrounding and

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: Any followup questions from the bench? MR. HANDZO: No, Your Honor.

JUDGE ROBERTS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STEINTHAL: No, Your Honor.

MR. JOSEPH: No, Your Honor. CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: All right.

Thank you. That completes your testimony.

(Witness excused.)

9 CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: You gents, 10 have anything to present before we adjourn?

MR. HANDZO: No, Your Honor. 11 12

We'll begin tomorrow morning with Ms. Kessler.

MR. TAYLOR: Your Honor, one housekeeping matter. Today we filed a Notice of Appearance of Gil Rosenstein who may join us later this week to appear on behalf of DiMA and we'll be giving you a courtesy copy

tomorrow morning in light of the --MR. JOSEPH: Your Honor, since we're talking about notices of appearances we also filed a Notice of Appearance last week for one of my partners, Tom Kirby, who

the procedures of this hearing.

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: We expect her to be able to demonstrate that.

MR. STEINTHAL: Yes.

JUDGE ROBERTS: Are you planning to be here the rest of the week, Mr.

7 Steinthal?

MR. STEINTHAL: I'm going to be back and forth, Judge Roberts. I'm doing the 10 best I can.

CHIEF JUDGE SLEDGE: We recess until 9:30 a.m. Off the record.

(Whereupon, at 5:28 p.m., the above-entitled matter recessed to reconvene at 9:30 a.m. the next day, November 28, 2006.)

16 17 18

19

20 21

22

160:15 170:15 176:7 age 218:15 above-entitled 1:18 63:2 146:18 184:21 188:21 193:10 aggregate 115:4,6 ability 32:20 52:8,19 253:8 293:14 199:13 202:21 221:9 205:22 55:4 58:20 80:20 224:3 231:4 232:5 absence 10:5 86:15 aggregated 19:17 81:22 94:12 95:3 173:4 196:3 233:22 242:13 aggregates 224:18 97:10 134:20 135:6 aggregating 27:9 absent 83:4 87:13 97:2 243:14 248:2 259:13 135:10,20 143:15 154:22 158:16 ago 81:10 123:10 285:11 289:22 145:12 146:4 159:3 absolute 220:4 223:22 ad 170:15 175:5 212:1 141:19 142:6,6,7 216:16,18,20,21 add 180:16,19 258:19 168:16 204:22 231:1 277:22 217:8 280:2 absolutely 51:2 65:14 243:12 250:8 251:7 adding 181:14 able 16:18,20 46:5 259:11 267:2 271:1 234:13 257:14 addition 101:11,21 53:21 54:1 63:6,20 102:11 215:9 262:20 271:15,19 282:10 69:6 70:16 97:1 99:3 academic 214:5,12,13 additional 103:7 109:3 agree 70:18 71:3,4,10 106:7 240:8 242:1,3 227:20 73:16 74:19.21 78:1 214:17 275:22 292:13 293:3 accept 75:14 79:4 address 10:9 163:2 78:4 80:13,21 93:4 ABLIN 5:5 134:10 144:14,16 204:10 108:16 111:3,12 about 12:12 14:13 addressed 59:3 147:6 158:13 259:2 117:14 118:8.17 15:11 18:21,22 25:6 accepted 8:17 9:3 addressing 41:7 119:1,2,7 121:21 27:2,22 29:14 31:20 Add'l 6:18 129:13 134:16 143:3 access 13:7 187:13 34:20 35:10 37:21 adjourn 291:10 147:10 148:9.12.19 194:11,12 197:3 40:3,14 43:5,19 198:9,10 200:22 adjust 37:5 266:16 152:18 166:9.15.19 45:17 46:14 47:5,11 201:3 207:8 225:13 288:14 172:1 177:6 178:22 47:13 57:4,17,19 225:17 226:1,2 adjusted 116:19 179:6 183:4 188:16 60:6 63:8 67:7 68:6 adjustment 1:9 10:7 191:7 195:16 199:4 accident 12:18 74:17 76:12 77:2,3 23:21 203:10 267:16 203:18 204:2 215:19 according 219:19 78:16 80:4 81:5,7 257:19 adjustments 269:15 258:4 287:21 84:16,18 89:1,16 account 10:7 140:8 admits 272:12 agreed 97:9 168:8 90:8 95:16 100:15,20 177:18 227:8 280:21 admitted 260:5 206:1 210:22 103:2,20 105:20 accuracy 223:17 adopted 62:3 agreement 6:8,10 113:7 114:13 122:7,9 271:13 ads 195:11 57:20 62:6 79:8 83:5 122:10 123:10,12 AccuRadio 4:18 33:5,7 advances 190:21 84:10,18 88:14 89:6 125:2 129:8,17,19 33:8,9,10,12,15,22 advantage 52:18.22 89:20 99:6,10 101:8 134:8 135:9 139:19 34:3,16 36:5 57:15,18 82:1 102:5,13,21 103:10 139:22.22 140:11 accurate 117:7 118:10 advantages 186:12 104:2 106:20 111:16 142:18 143:9 150:6,7 118:16 234:11 270:9 advent 140:5 117:22 126:15 150:9 151:14.21 accurately 223:21 advertisements 195:10 148:16,21 149:9 153:16 155:22 158:1 accustomed 23:17 195:13 150:6,7 151:1 152:20 164:2 165:15 166:1,6 achieve 174:17 advertiser 169:3 153:7,14 154:15,22 166:20 167:5,17,18 acknowledge 102:19 advertising 56:10 73:9 155:2,6,9,10,12,13 168:22 170:4,13 acknowledged 104:18 affect 31:17,19 39:2 155:22 156:5,13 175:13 184:9 185:6 acquire 276:3 51:1 152:19 161:9 157:2,9,17,22 158:9 187:11 190:5,8 192:2 acquired 54:18 165:16 278:4 158:13,14,16 159:2 196:20 197:4 199:3 affected 209:7,9 271:22 166:2 161:19,21 162:13 203:17 205:21 across 43:3 219:14 affects 139:7 193:17 194:16 206:10 209:13 196:11,14 204:8,20 223:2 after 11:19 20:14 21:5 211:14 212:3,21 act 87:2 21:19 25:22 26:3 205:11 209:5,6,8,13 217:17 218:8 223:16 action 288:10 37:20 53:1 145:5,5 209:16,19,21 210:4,5 228:9 231:11,12,15 activities 272:21 159:22 196:1 214:3,3 210:9 211:3,8 237:4,22 245:15 273:15 260:20 agreements 56:16,19 246:16 250:22 actor 96:1 56:22 65:10,11,19 afternoon 147:2,3 252:17 260:15 acts 135:21 208:20,21 83:17 97:13 99:16 261:21 266:22 actual 16:4 44:7 154:5 afterthought 142:21 116:9,10 118:1 271:22 273:16 275:6 again 8:19 24:13 26:2 169:15 174:12 158:18,19 159:14 275:15,16 276:7,16 36:6 38:4 42:22 180:20 188:19 163:11,14 164:1,16 277:4,17,22 278:4 197:12 199:8 227:15 66:12 76:10 88:4 164:18,22 185:12 279:4 281:12,17 246:18,20 284:6 92:20 96:10 101:18 193:14 194:4,13,16 282:15 283:5,10,13 actually 16:18 19:13 108:11 125:3 142:16 194:18 209:18 284:6,11,21 285:20 26:6 36:4,15 45:4 187:5 201:16 206:5 275:17,19 282:2 286:8,13 288:7 289:6 46:4 54:8 62:2 86:18 235:15 268:2 288:10 284:10 289:19 291:20 agrees 102:15 115:22 119:12 120:2 against 110:7 157:11 above 80:20 196:6 139:15 150:6 151:2 202:16 ahead 62:20 68:18 218:15

184:15 akin 25:8 81:4 ALAN 5:17 alan.weinshcel@weil... album 140:2 180:14.14 albums 37:1 38:8 181:4 182:14 183:19 222:1 alla 59:16,18 197:9,17 199:19 200:9 201:6 208:4 allocation 186:5 allow 32:21 53:12 63:20 65:7,15 66:5 66:14 allowed 52:17 allows 44:1 almost 27:12 222:22 249:19 alone 50:4 along 154:19 192:3 198:15 202:12 238:6 already 37:15 74:17 104:18 189:6 242:13 279:19 alter 264:6 alternative 51:11 200:4 although 149:3 162:15 172:8 177:17 230:9 235:15 278:15 280:15 287:19 always 42:9 140:15 264:2,12 Amazon 124:6 178:9 Amazon.com 33:11 among 135:17,21 215:4 amount 22:1 41:13 52:4 138:2 167:13 176:6 201:12 224:21 228:11 269:5 278:17 288:14 290:7 amounts 53:10 289:21 analogy 152:22 analysis 9:14 10:8,19 11:3 16:19 17:7,9 24:10 25:19,21 26:21 26:21 27:3,5,18 28:2 28:14 29:1,2,18 30:12 66:16 68:10 79:2 107:18 109:17 110:18 112:5,8 121:3 121:8 123:2 126:2,7 126:20,22 127:4,11 127:13 131:8 152:1 161:3 162:7 164:4 175:2,8,9 178:1,11 212:19 219:4 226:6 233:1 240:16,18 241:2 242:22 262:15 262:19 263:3 265:3

265:22 269:6 273:22

280:22 283:20 285:4 analyst 151:3 analysts 150:21 151:4 analyze 138:20 212:12 224:20 228:11 232:5 analyzed 225:17 231:5 233:10 analyzing 85:7 121:14 125:15 127:1 186:5 237:16 ANDERSON 3:2 anecdotal 213:12,16,17 **Annual 221:22** anomalies 30:22 31:4 another 78:9 81:2,3 98:4 138:4 139:2 155:21 194:19 201:22 216:2 238:12 253:5 262:20 267:5 268:7 280:4,5 292:20 answer 27:17 28:12 30:3,10 54:5 73:7 74:4 76:17 91:5 107:1 112:13 120:8 120:19 122:8,13 126:19,19 127:13 135:1 168:16 169:21 206:5 252:14,15 263:10,14 265:15 271:18,20 272:3,11 272:20 273:10,11 275:11,13 answered 77:13 92:14 247:7 answers 120:22 263:17 270:14 282:16 antitrust 82:3 Anybody 72:20 anyone 229:6 258:13 anything 29:8 30:2,12 34:20 37:20 58:18 131:10 134:3 142:15 153:19,21 164:2 168:13 170:12,17 226:5 227:16 228:8 235:10 266:16 271:12,17 272:10 273:14 277:13 282:21 291:10 AOL 4:1 165:16 206:22 apart 108:6 apologies 39:16 apologize 253:20 apparent 266:17 apparently 200:20 201:2 appeal 210:19 211:4 appear 265:19 291:16 appearance 291:15,21

appearances 2:1 291:20 appeared 292:18 appending 211:4 Apple 187:17,19 applicable 163:20,22 164:3,16,18 applied 8:18 applies 206:8 apply 164:8,11 203:8 applying 164:13 182:11 appointment 292:2 approach 9:18 15:10 40:5,13 51:15 56:3 56:12 57:3,13,16 59:10,21 60:9,10 61:8 62:2,11 134:8 227:11 237:19 284:4 288:22 292:10 appropriate 40:6 61:19 111:16 159:14 278:5 appropriateness 30:11 approximate 227:4 approximately 44:21 181:10 183:6,9,20 approximation 208:3 Arapahoe 5:13 area 12:20 argued 207:6 argument 63:11 64:2 64:12 arguments 63:14,19,21 arise 59:4 arose 205:20 around 68:7 81:7 167:18 201:20 202:7 202:17,20 203:5 277:11 282:6 285:12 arrange 13:7 arrangement 133:5 277:8 arrangements 163:5 284:7 285:1,8 arranges 133:13 arrive 161:3,11 arrived 156:5 159:22 160:4,4 161:21 arriving 162:13 article 214:14 artificially 88:2 artists 132:13 **ASCAP** 82:12 86:10,11 93:9,10,12,19 98:6 102:18 108:14 111:13,15 ASCAP/BMI 93:2 ascribe 180:7 204:5 ascribing 200:11

201:12

aside 68:4

asked 12:18 13:13 18:4 18:21 19:11 20:17,19 22:13 72:6 74:7 75:3 76:14 77:7 91:1,4 92:20 96:8 122:5,22 167:17 168:5 200:18 209:13 229:8 240:7 245:7,15,22 252:12 264:5,10,12,14 273:7 273:16 275:5 276:6 279:3 281:12 asking 95:15,21 101:2 102:9 106:22 120:22 211:1 asks 245:10,13 261:21 278:13 aspect 41:7 66:20 197:10 200:21 aspects 10:3 12:3 114:15 134:12 167:19 196:21 assertion 285:21 286:2 assessing 225:8,11 assign 32:5 assist 248:11,12 292:3 assistance 110:22 assistants 12:19 Assoc 4:1 associated 47:14 68:22 97:17 98:19 100:22 103:5.22 105:14 107:20 109:20 110:8 117:18 118:5 134:4 Associates 8:11 assume 36:17 149:3 229:2 236:6 267:11 assumed 26:22 28:14 36:13 assumes 90:20 assuming 36:14 168:7 179:18 **assumption** 34:9 37:8 75:18 78:18,21 218:18 **assumptions** 168:12,19 ASTLE 5:6 astray 99:14 ATH 204:12 205:22 attached 137:8 attachment 188:21 attempt 212:12 attempted 13:1 attempting 218:22 attention 265:21 290:12,15,17 attorneys 292:10 attracting 191:19 attractive 202:3 attracts 138:15

attributable 190:20

191:2,14 192:8,11

196:7,10,15,17 201:8 attributed 200:2 AT&T 198:4 audience 34:2 audio 106:20 107:5,15 107:20 authorized 102:12 availability 50:20 51:4 available 33:3 50:7,10 59:16 70:20 80:5 172:7 174:22 197:16 206:22 217:10,13,22 292:3,21 Ave 2:18 3:19 Avenue 1:14 2:12 4:12 4:15 5:18 average 16:1,4 21:6 34:10,14 38:2 113:5 180:13 218:7,17 219:5,8,22 220:6 221:22 222:21,22 223:2,13 267:9 avoid 96:4 156:14,22 avoidance 186:20 avoiding 144:19 aware 11:11 54:9,15,21 62:1 79:19 80:2 94:15 98:5 105:6 117:16 131:22 141:8 160:11,19 204:15 away 137:13 272:5 a.m 1:19 7:2 63:1,3 293:12,15 В

B 2:17 232:4,18 233:3 233:10,16,17 234:1,2 234:9,22 235:3,15 236:10 243:22 245:21 249:4 250:19 251:1,2,7 255:8 back 7:4,7 14:9 26:18 65:4 75:5 81:12 92:18 97:11 103:14 114:12 122:1 136:8 138:8 151:5 153:16 153:18,20 162:1,5,10 168:16 188:17 205:12 213:3 220:2 231:3 243:21 244:8 245:16 252:7 257:20 259:15 272:19 278:7 292:19 293:9 backdrop 84:15 85:3,3 85:10,11 88:14 90:16 backed 118:9.16 backend 185:6 background 40:22 128:1 backwards 235:9 bad 74:22

badly 138:18 balance 284:4 band 50:15,15,16 129:2 131:20 132:21 133:17,18 137:3,9 bands 50:12 132:2,8,20 banner 195:11 base 76:15 187:19 188:8,14 201:13 239:10 248:16 255:14 based 15:21 32:1 37:10 39:22 51:11 78:17,20 78:21 79:6 92:5 95:22 98:22 104:5 110:22 131:16 140:7 152:22 153:5 155:3 155:22 158:9 162:5 166:12 170:19 173:20 180:19 183:1 202:5 216:14 219:11 222:2 223:10 240:20 246:7 268:3 279:14 282:4,9 289:15 basic 41:11 51:14 59:6 269:12 basically 53:17 124:5 142:15 144:8,19 145:9 204:11 283:18 basis 8:19 15:13 18:5 53:3 59:17 67:1 81:22 119:4 120:14 144:21 146:8 155:3 155:14.16 169:19 187:21 197:17 201:6 205:16 206:1 207:3 211:18 264:5 Bates 99:22 193:17 221:6 248:14 bear 173:7 bears 193:17 Beatles 137:2,4,8 become 212:1 before 1:1,21 7:10 20:13 21:2,19 25:22 26:3 41:4 53:1 55:9 63:11,19 91:16 97:11 100:16 129:3 139:19 140:5 142:13 143:21 165:15 166:1 186:5 192:21 203:17 210:19 211:4 235:22 238:3 255:7 256:1

257:6 258:1,6,11

292:18

beg 184:10

began 20:2,22

begin 7:10,12 62:21

226:11 291:12

259:7 263:15 264:1

264:14 272:8 291:10

198:6,21 199:18,21 beginning 26:19 benefit 64:8 187:5 52:10 53:22 78:21 begins 189:20 benefits 140:16 186:16 112:14 114:11 200:4,13 201:12,14 204:1 206:3,4,16 behalf 2:2,15 3:1,11,16 best 17:16 24:16 60:3 141:22 143:16 207:12,15 4:1,18 5:1,11,16 75:14,14 163:6 217:2 147:15 148:22 149:7 bundled 59:3,5,7,19 156:19 190:18 293:10 149:17 152:11 160:6 better 48:20 168:6 169:7.8 174:7 209:17 61:22 62:8,10,13 291:16 behavior 52:21 53:17 220:5 213:13 233:13 252:4 166:11 186:6 188:2 271:9 276:1 280:12 190:10,13 197:19 159:15 between 10:21 11:22 198:11,13 199:8,13 being 35:9 52:20 54:5 14:10 21:19 22:1 bother 194:15 bottom 72:14,15,22 200:20 201:7,10 58:22 80:4,5 85:21 26:11 27:1,11 28:15 77:10 100:1 119:15 203:1 204:4,11,11 90:5 92:10,18 93:10 28:22 47:12 49:22 96:4 107:2,4 121:19 62:6 68:21 83:17 120:4 122:4 147:19 205:14,17,21 207:7 123:11 124:19 128:6 84:10 85:9,13,14 153:22 209:4 246:8 207:17 208:5,9 129:5,6 137:20 139:1 89:6 90:11 92:3 99:6 bought 124:20 131:17 276:14 bundles 196:20 200:22 140:13 143:20 148:8 114:4,16 118:11 220:12,13 223:21,22 155:15 156:10 121:8 123:20 130:13 263:11,14 267:1 201:3,19 159:14 197:12 132:3 137:1 149:9 268:1,12,13,20,21 **bundling** 197:3 202:8 222:10 266:6 275:22 152:11 154:6 156:6 270:22 271:7 272:21 203:8 burning 13:16 276:16 279:16 156:19 158:20 160:7 273:1 278:11,17,19 281:13 284:12 163:14 164:16,18 Boulder 5:14 business 12:12 14:19 belief 98:22 186:21 194:4 199:1 Boulevard 3:13 50:22 152:19 153:11 believe 9:21 18:15 19:1 204:8 214:20 232:10 branded 207:3 175:3 268:5 286:4 branding 207:13 287:2 289:9 24:5 32:8 40:5 60:11 235:17 239:17 243:15 250:7 257:16 breaching 180:17 businessmen 290:13,13 61:10,19 62:17 74:13 break 63:5 146:13 button 32:12,14,16 78:10 88:1 90:6 98:9 257:22 259:11 271:14 275:17 184:11,16 187:7 33:1,11 34:7,19 38:7 103:11 111:17 127:15 130:22 Beverly 3:14 280:1 38:11,21 39:8 175:12 breakdown 19:17 137:22 156:4 163:3 Beyonce 75:1 178:3,8,11 180:20 beyond 27:19 29:5 30:3 breaking 280:5 183:8 215:20 216:14 168:18 169:5 176:13 176:18 185:9 189:17 54:6 148:8 200:17 brick 124:3,6 217:8 194:20 197:8 199:22 buttons 12:6 177:19 228:8 253:21 **brief** 215:18 206:7 209:14 215:17 biased 279:16 **briefed** 292:22 215:17 216:16 216:22 218:3,7 223:3 big 235:16 287:7 briefing 138:9 buy 12:5 19:6 22:14,14 bigger 38:5 125:21 228:14 229:12 briefly 186:9 32:12,14,16,21,22 33:10 34:6,19 35:5,7 238:12 241:3 243:11 billion 175:5 bring 95:17 156:21 243:17 245:4 251:7 Billy 129:1 broad 67:21 70:6,11,13 38:7,11,20,21 39:5,8 **binding** 108:19 253:13 260:14,18 71:7 73:10,14 74:8 75:9 173:13,14 261:19 264:4 265:7 74:14 76:16,19 78:2 175:12 177:19 178:3 bit 14:14 64:8 118:19 274:11 275:11 78:18 80:4 145:5 177:21 187:16 178:8,10,17 179:1 bjoseph@wrf.com broadband 225:17 180:20 183:8 215:17 276:18 278:18 279:16 280:15 5:10 broadcast 148:3,11 215:20,21 216:14,15 216:16 217:7 223:6 believed 209:15 241:5 blanket 67:21 70:7,11 broadcasters 3:1 5:1,4 below 19:8 181:17 289:20 223:12 276:13 72:6 76:17 **Broadcasting** 3:17,17 237:19 238:3 239:10 278:14,14 Block 2:6 buyer 167:12 BMG 37:2,3,7,10,11 broader 70:11 72:6 bench 283:2 291:2 benchmark 9:13,17,20 62:7 79:9 99:7,11 121:9,16 122:17 buyers 10:2 126:14 125:21 187:7 226:20 135:5,10,16 9:22 10:8,10,21 196:2 BMG's 183:2 284:14 buying 38:2 70:14,15 17:19 24:20 26:20 BMG-Verizon 6:8 broadly 123:4 170:15 173:22 174:1 28:14 29:1 31:22 broke 19:13 179:3 197:14 252:11 39:22 40:4 41:18 BMI 82:12 86:10,11 93:9,11,13,19 98:6 48:21 64:22 65:18 broken 15:20 272:7 102:19 108:15 brought 110:7 111:17 buys 218:8,17 66:16 67:2,9 83:19 111:14,15 BRUCE 5:5 B4 5:13 84:13 85:1 89:2,13 141:13 152:20 153:6 Board 1:1 85:11 Brynjolfsson's 211:22 C 153:14 157:18 160:6 bucket 191:8 193:2 body 83:8,20 C 254:16 255:3,9 163:17 164:9,13,13 **boil** 40:17 build 227:12 Bonneville 5:2 33:5 bullets 239:8 CA 4:4 205:8 209:7,16,20 calculate 38:1 35:10,12,13 36:9 bundle 59:9,13,14 60:8 213:4 226:16 benchmarking 280:21 216:9 217:10 60:13,17 166:8,13,18 calculated 267:17 benchmarks 153:5 both 14:19 25:2 40:9 166:19,22 167:3,11 **calculation** 30:20 31:3 beneficial 156:8 41:10,12,13 52:3,9 167:14 197:10 198:5 34:13 35:20,22 36:1

36:10,12 168:20 200:3 201:21 202:15 202:18 203:12 calculations 26:2 32:7 177:15 183:1 California 3:14 call 134:11 180:10 198:3,4 201:19 206:19 277:11 called 7:19 14:4,7 15:16 44:4 52:21 194:13 230:17 236:2 247:4 calls 7:15 came 1:18 98:14 267:19,20 275:14,16 292:15 cannibalization 168:15 169:15 170:13 cannibalized 168:22 169:3 171:10.15 172:18,20 173:17 174:18 Cannon 3:4 **capable 126:18** capitalization 165:4,10 165:17 capture 26:2 56:5 290:3,4 captured 56:14 57:17 109:21 130:1 care 142:17 281:13 careful 292:10 CARP 156:21 162:4 163:13 206:10,18 209:22 210:10 carried 224:13 carry 84:16 163:16 209:21 210:5 carry-forward 89:20 carte 59:16,18 197:9 197:17 199:19 200:9 201:6 208:4 case 9:11,15,16 11:12 11:20 16:13 20:15 21:22 35:13 38:7 39:19 40:7,21 42:5 46:2 49:22 51:8 61:22 64:18 69:2 70:4 75:10 77:4 79:9 85:15,16,18 87:9 89:2 92:5 97:12 116:3,18 120:20 130:11 131:2 133:16 134:12 137:14 138:17 141:9 160:8 160:13,16,22 161:19 169:1 172:20 186:3 188:1 197:1 202:13 233:13 269:11

290:16 292:17,21

cases 45:22 52:16 91:18 115:21 116:4 191:16 catalog 71:7 73:15 74:8 78:3,19 80:5 137:21 138:1 139:4 144:6,8 144:17,19 catalogs 73:9,11,12 75:21 76:7 78:8 categories 19:9,14,18 38:5 66:13 187:7 191:10 192:22 195:19 203:13 categorize 17:17 category 16:6 19:19 24:13 cause 11:7 28:19,20 caused 21:21 caution 103:19 237:19 239:12 CBI 3:1 CD 10:11 11:4,7 13:16 21:10 23:5,16 24:4,5 26:3,9,22 27:4,13 30:11 31:22 32:8 34:17,22 35:17 36:15 36:17 38:8 44:8 46:10 179:9 215:11 217:4 218:21 219:13 219:22 223:1,18 224:5,14 226:3 249:16 267:3 272:5 272:22 287:14.15 CDs 13:17 15:19 16:1 20:13,18 21:6,7,8 22:2 23:22 26:17 32:17 33:10,15 34:6 34:15,16 35:6,7,16 36:6,11,14,18 77:22 126:8 141:2,11,14,22 142:8,8 216:21 217:3 218:9,13,17 219:1,5 220:5,13,14 221:18 222:2,2 223:1,6,12 252:11 267:6,9 268:1 268:8,12,13,20,21 271:3,3,9 272:8 278:17 287:9 cell 43:19 45:2 cents 87:19 90:2 104:19 105:12 179:21 180:8 certain 10:20 16:3 35:6 45:22 69:1 74:1 87:4 88:4 144:5 145:11 161:9 166:7 167:7,19 176:6 192:22 198:11 202:22 240:20 274:7 288:18 289:20 certainly 27:12 47:16 48:10 58:18 65:6

92:8 101:13 106:2 116:7 124:8 148:9 149:20 158:5 159:10 161:22 176:13 177:19 179:9 203:4 219:10 246:4 276:17 277:7 288:17,19 290:12 certainty 186:17,18 challenge 133:21 challenged 90:6 94:11 95:10 96:1,13 change 21:19,21 23:5 24:6 26:3 36:10 64:7 117:3 118:18 142:11 142:15 152:18 changed 16:15 152:16 153:11.12 changes 43:13 223:9 278:6 changing 128:18 Channel 5:2 channels 141:5 206:21 characteristic 136:3 137:10 characteristics 10:1 80:15 123:19 127:5 135:8 147:12 characterization 67:13 88:18 121:22 characterize 276:19 characterized 135:4 **charge** 94:12 140:15 168:7 charged 147:6 169:11 201:9 charges 56:8 charging 168:6 chart 17:10 26:7 42:13 42:14 67:19 69:16,20 81:19,21 85:22 86:5 87:16 92:22 101:1 103:3,21 109:22 111:2 113:17 114:19 115:9,20 117:9 136:8 charter 93:17 check 220:2 248:9 251:15 Chief 1:22 7:3,8,14 8:20 9:2 21:13,15 27:15 28:9 29:3,10 30:1 46:17,20 47:18 48:5,11 54:12 55:9 55:15 57:7 62:19 63:4 64:3,6,11 88:20 90:22 91:8 95:19 96:6 100:17 101:9,15 103:12,15 146:15,20 184:12,14,18 185:1 189:5 208:15 253:4

253:10,17,21 254:4

260:4 272:14 274:18 274:21 281:5 282:13 282:20 283:1 285:15 291:1,6,9 292:8 293:2.11 choice 133:8 139:5 171:4 choices 135:16 139:7 choose 134:20 135:6,11 135:21 139:2 144:8 144:10 145:5,6,13,15 146:5 choosing 174:13 chosen 196:14 Circuit 210:19 211:5 circumstance 60:6 132:21 circumstances 131:5 131:12 138:10 153:6 153:11 158:4,7 159:8 161:9 cite 151:18 211:15 213:19 214:8 city 224:18 287:16 claim 32:1 41:8,9 286:11 claimed 228:21 270:21 clarify 7:11 30:9 132:17 clarity 187:6 classify 58:21 clause 103:2 clear 5:2 56:21 64:22 67:3 68:17 69:8 100:8 113:18 142:17 151:11 162:11 167:8 169:13 213:15 clearer 202:1 clearly 19:2 138:4 246:13 click 32:20 192:5 clicking 178:3,8 clicks 191:16 clip 41:21 69:19 77:18 78:1 111:2,4 close 38:16 81:1 85:17 278:20 closer 215:11,14 closing 63:11,14,19,21 64:2 Club 110:13 **cluster 255:12** Co 3:17 colleague 292:1 collected 56:11 112:18 114:5 collects 31:14 116:2 Collegiate 3:1 Colorado 5:14 colored 157:21

column 21:8 90:11.14

52:4 213:1

108:10 221:21 237:10 combination 141:13 combined 161:13 169:8 255:8 come 27:10 60:15 114:12 126:15 138:8 146:21 181:9 183:6 187:18 188:8,14,17 203:15 221:10 227:12 231:3 232:18 comes 43:1 88:12 96:17 116:17 145:18 158:9 158:13 coming 61:2 270:8 292:11 command 207:9 commands 67:22 comments 27:18 72:18 220:16 254:3,6 commerce 195:14 commercial 147:16 157:9 commercially 272:22 commission 33:13 Committee 5:2,4,17 common 53:8 158:2 Communications 5:2,3 companies 53:11 80:9 83:17 84:12 99:3 106:17 110:7 114:5 115:2 140:3,22 141:17 142:5,21 144:5 151:6,7,9 156:20 162:22 163:4 163:12 164:17,19 169:7 201:18 204:10 212:22 274:5 275:18 281:19,19 284:19 company 46:7 99:7 102:15 107:14 116:1 117:11 139:4 144:2 194:19 201:17 287:8 comparable 197:16 219:13 232:3 248:22 255:6 compare 48:18 120:22 172:22 220:6 226:15 compared 31:22 compares 206:16 comparing 22:15 238:3 239:14 comparison 24:20 27:21 114:16 141:21 238:10 comparisons 29:17 116:19 compatible 179:3 compelling 70:8 compensated 45:10

compensation 43:6 44:18 68:1 105:5 114:16 116:21 117:9 118:12 competing 134:20 competition 137:13 **competitive** 71:1 73:13 73:20 82:5 86:12 93:20 134:19 135:8 135:18 137:6 complaint 146:3 complete 55:3 101:17 137:21 completely 169:10 completes 55:13 291:7 compliant 10:13 24:18 84:5 197:20 261:8 component 166:11,22 167:14 components 126:16 167:4,6 composition 100:8 101:6 102:14 compositions 102:18 compromise 159:22 compulsory 84:15 85:3 87:18,20 88:7,15 90:15,17 93:1 94:5 94:13 95:11,14 96:2 96:15,16 97:2 104:21 157:7 281:20 compunction 89:15 computed 32:2 concept 282:4,5,9 conceptual 40:13 concern 29:11 89:1 91:7 281:17 concerned 63:8 286:13 concerning 27:18 concerns 277:22 conclude 32:4 conclusion 27:10 38:12 39:2 72:8 73:7 117:4 214:6,14 242:5 conclusions 28:1 29:18 29:21 31:2,17,20 38:10 concrete 191:9 condition 188:4 **conditional** 65:2,8,12 65:16 66:6,10,14,18 67:10 142:11 conditions 159:7 288:2 conduct 151:12 conducted 12:8 13:20 13:21 14:2,3,8 69:9 77:11 119:4 262:19 conducting 265:21 conducts 12:13 confidence 159:3 239:16,21 240:9,13

266:4 confident 101:4 256:11 confidential 100:10 193:16 211:14 212:21 confirm 219:4 confuse 66:1 confused 188:6 confusing 19:5 confusion 244:15 246:4 257:15 Congress 1:2,14 Connecticut 2:12 3:19 connection 185:7 195:6 240:9 consent 82:3,13,16,19 83:2 85:12 86:22 93:13 consequence 143:19 conservative 218:19 consider 10:14 63:18 110:17 133:14 158:19 169:22 191:21 202:17 203:4 204:7 206:9 207:12 207:13 246:5 286:4 289:9 290:14 consideration 154:4 155:3 158:18 161:8 161:13 175:2 190:17 204:16 205:19 284:18 considerations 140:9 285:13 288:12 considered 10:16 46:9 48:1 58:13 192:10 250:6 considering 119:5 124:17 200:6 consisted 228:19 consistent 15:10 38:6 56:15,17 205:9 consistently 91:21 consists 198:8 255:2 Constantine 3:4 constitutes 102:13 constrain 87:11.12 constrained 82:2 83:6 86:9,14 87:17 88:2 92:22 115:11 284:10 constraining 87:1 constrains 95:3 constraint 84:2 87:3,5 94:2 96:5 108:18 135:22 281:22 constraints 82:12 108:14 115:16 construct 87:16 constructed 283:8 construed 93:18 161:1 233:2

consulting 8:7,10 consumer 12:13 45:1,8 74:22 146:7 166:17 166:20 178:2 197:13 217:4 218:7,17 consumers 59:8 60:5 61:19 75:11 79:3 124:20 137:22 276:10 278:1,9 context 102:4 106:19 185:16 205:4 206:6 265:11 continue 12:19 continues 113:9 130:15 contract 53:20 282:6 contractual 277:8 285:1 contrary 214:14 242:4 control 52:19 53:13,19 147:17 235:10 273:14.20 Cont'd 30:7 146:22 185:3 208:18 241:15 conversation 79:16 conversations 77:16 converted 36:13 copies 110:8,15 copy 9:9 109:7,13 291:17 copying 106:5 copyright 1:1 42:15,16 43:7 45:7,10 50:1 51:9 52:6,7 53:13 94:6,18 106:11,20 107:21 118:14 129:12 137:15 154:12,21 202:5 277:12,15 copyrighted 80:22 107:6,13 copyrights 40:20 49:14 53:19 284:21 corner 72:14 100:1 119:16,19,21 122:4 Corp 4:1 5:2,3,4 correct 11:10 68:10,11 68:16 69:13 70:3 77:13,14 78:10 80:9 80:10 85:5 93:13 97:6 98:9,21 104:21 105:11 107:22 110:1 110:18,21 112:1 113:21 115:13 118:16,22 121:5 126:5 127:8 130:17 138:16 147:9 148:16 150:10 152:12 153:14,15 155:6,17 159:15 160:18 161:4 161:5 162:8,14

165:22 168:11,17

169:17 185:10,13 186:8,14,15,17 198:16 211:20 213:5 213:9,19,20 214:1,15 214:16 215:7.13.22 216:1,3,4,6,7 217:5,6 222:7,15,16,18,19 223:3 224:19 225:10 225:20 226:12,18 228:14,22 229:16,17 230:4,13,20,21 231:1 231:2,9 232:6,7,13 232:14,20,21 233:5 233:12,21 234:20 235:2 236:4,6,13 237:7,8,12,13,20 238:5 239:5,12,18,19 239:22 240:12 242:9 243:3,10 244:6,7 245:8.12 247:6.15.16 247:19.20 248:1.3 249:11.12.14.20 250:3.4.10.11.15.16 251:8.14.17.19.20.22 252:1.6 254:18 255:13,18 256:3,4,7 256:8,13,14,19,20 257:2,7,15 258:1,16 259:8,9,13,14 261:18 262:2,7,13,14 263:11 263:12,15,16,18,19 264:15,16 270:14,15 270:18,19 271:4,10 274:10 287:3 correctly 25:3 159:18 176:14 290:1 correlated 226:2 **Corvell's 217:16** cost 80:20 120:6,7 141:6 157:1 286:14 287:14,15 289:13 costing 219:21 220:11 233:19 costs 112:17 114:9 118:5,18,21,22 119:5 120:10,11,14,17 139:22 144:20 156:14 157:11 286:6 287:19 288:19,20 289:10 counsel 2:10 7:19 count 171:15 239:10 249:16 counted 248:5 counting 258:15 counts 238:3 239:10 couple 115:19,21 157:22 177:10 229:10 course 33:2,15 75:16 184:1 265:21 268:4

292:17 court 9:17 82:19 83:1,5 85:12,16 86:3,10,15 86:18,22 87:4,8,11 87:14 88:11 90:15,17 91:17,18,19 93:2,14 93:17 94:17 111:14 111:18,19,21 154:22 162:18 189:2 210:20 211:5 281:21 292:9 courtesy 291:17 courts 82:13 93:13.19 96:21 108:15 Court's 184:10 cover 50:12,15 94:20 97:15 108:22 129:2 131:20 132:2,8,19 133:10 137:3,9 178:1 215:18 286:5 covered 95:11,13 101:7 215:19 covers 132:14 COWIE 2:4 co-branded 207:2 **CPB 2:15** CRAIG 2:4 CRB 1:8 88:11 156:22 161:14 created 123:13 269:14 creates 133:13 145:15 creating 185:11 202:21 creation 107:6 117:19 **Creative 5:11,12** credence 204:19 205:3 criticism 51:21 140:12 187:11 criticize 121:2 171:14 187:12 criticized 112:4 cross 6:2 15:17 62:21 64:19 146:22 185:3 208:18 228:8 241:15 crossover 286:19 **CRUSE 4:14** current 160:12 174:16 290:8 customer 11:5 19:3,4 21:4 23:15 35:5,7 39:5 49:4,5,9,12 70:17 75:6 167:3 171:1 176:7 179:11 191:16,19 220:7 261:4 272:3,4,6 273:8 278:15,19 customers 13:4 16:1,5 16:14 18:10 19:18 20:17,20,21,22 21:6 24:8 26:8,12 37:1,4 168:22 169:2 170:1 171:9.15.19 172:6.18 172:20 173:3,10,13

173:22,22 174:5,6,19 174:20 177:18 178:15 197:18 200:1 200:3 219:15 221:12 221:15,17 246:1,6 252:16 280:8 281:1 customized 62:7 65:19 67:9 83:11,18 84:3 85:17 87:9 89:2,4

D D 3:2,12 4:21 data 6:11 12:5,8,9,17 13:8 14:21 16:8,9,20 21:10 23:12,14 26:5 26:6 27:2,9,19 28:3,5 29:14.16 30:13.19.21 31:5,9 32:6,12,15,16 32:16 33:1,2,8,14,19 33:21 34:1,4,5,20 35:11,12,19 36:2,20 37:5,9 38:7,11 39:8 40:18 141:8,22 178:5 183:6 199:5,7 216:8 216:13 217:1,17 218:12 219:1,11,19 219:19 221:8 224:4,8 224:16,17,18,20 225:6,7 226:4,12,15 227:1,4,6,18 228:10 237:16 240:6,9,16,19 240:21 241:19 242:3 242:8 243:14 246:18 246:19 265:3,3,5,5 266:16,20 268:2,5 269:5,8,9,13,15 date 6:13,14,21,22 68:7 dated 221:11 dates 64:2 dave@sbrcreative.com 5:15 **DAVID** 2:3 4:6,21 5:12 davidoxenford@dwt... 4:24 **Davis 4:22** day 63:10,11,13 64:3 130:16 146:19 158:11 293:15 days 63:18 DC 2:19 3:21 4:23 211:4 deal 62:8 104:7 145:8 147:22 156:18 290:18 dealing 35:2 160:8 161:7 203:20

deals 83:12 162:21

214:17 249:3,3

63:16,17 84:21

December 13:21 19:22

dealt 190:13

235:20 236:2 243:2 127:7 demonstrate 293:3 119:9 124:8,10 263:10,18 245:8,12,20 246:11 distinguishing 85:9,13 219:17 235:17 280:7 decide 262:10 demonstrating 200:10 decided 95:17 98:12 247:5,9 249:2 250:19 85:14 denied 272:16 288:21 **distributed** 206:12,13 decision 94:22 98:13 **DENISE 2:17** differences 160:6 251:3 252:5 254:20 214:20 215:4 239:17 271:8 273:2,3,18 distribution 121:10,17 139:22 140:4,6,7 deny 52:8 280:9,11,13,18 122:18 123:21 124:2 143:20 154:11 depend 149:17,21 289:15 206:10 210:11 287:1 different 12:3 15:11 Digitally 4:19 125:5 126:3,8 127:6 150:1 19:17 21:7 22:15 289:5 dependent 50:3 266:10 **DiMA** 4:1 84:11 89:6 141:4,5 266:8,10 281:19 288:20 decisions 119:3 120:8 28:4,4,6 33:4 39:22 204:9 209:6 291:16 **depending** 21:4 87:5 **DiMA-RIAA** 209:19 divided 19:13 34:7 41:3 42:17 43:6 120:13 290:14 167:4 depends 86:14 87:12 49:14,21 56:10 57:10 dire 55:10 dividing 36:3 218:13 declined 142:3 141:20 172:8 60:14 76:22 79:1 direct 6:2 7:22 11:12 dleary@npr.org 2:21 declines 226:3 deposition 6:6 47:12 **DMCA** 10:13 24:17 decrease 266:4 92:9 104:11 109:14 27:14 30:7 32:20 decree 82:3,13,16 55:8 68:8 71:12,20 109:19 111:22 38:13 39:4,19 49:7 146:3 85:12 86:22 91:20 74:4.6 76:10 77:3 112:17,18,19 121:1 49:11 56:8 188:20 Docket 1:6 deduct 116:20 104:9 106:4 119:12 123:19 124:12.14 216:16,18 229:13 document 6:5 9:7,9 deemed 100:10 233:8 126:11,16 128:5,16 260:14 278:8 71:14 100:3,16 120:2 122:1.16.22 define 58:3 229:10 148:18 239:1,1 133:13 135:17 139:3 directionally 239:11 191:12 192:13 244:14 139:4,20 140:8 directly 18:3 46:1 49:4 193:16,19 194:22 243:8 derive 218:11 240:8,13 defined 142:7 222:10 145:20 146:14 157:6 53:19 54:1 60:12 220:18,20 221:5 61:1 79:18 128:14 231:17 234:6 236:15 234:8,9 243:22 244:2 derived 183:8 219:1 157:19 161:8.10 182:17 188:1 189:6 135:10 190:19 191:2 237:3 238:15.21 254:16,18 256:6 derives 228:6 defining 132:8 185:18 describe 56:3 171:1,10 192:4 198:19 199:2 196:6,9,15,16 201:4 239:2 244:17 254:9 206:6.6 219:13 206:14,22 225:2 255:4 260:6 269:19 186:12 247:2 definitely 190:9 described 54:17 130:1 221:19 224:15 226:8 doing 20:11 30:19 79:3 definition 55:20,21 169:21 196:5 239:15 228:12 238:11 disadvantage 71:5 88:22 96:3 123:1 56:3,14 57:1,12 58:9 250:18 251:12 269:8 287:22 73:16,20 148:1 158:11 181:22 58:17,19 102:7 107:1 describes 227:17 288:1,2 289:13,14 disadvantages 57:22 238:13 293:9 176:2 184:9 185:8 descriptions 234:12 differential 26:22 58:1 dollars 18:7 142:20 disagree 137:18 139:6 186:10 188:19 design 15:8 226:19 differentiate 224:9 144:18 182:10 designed 77:19 205:5 210:10 290:10,15 189:19,22 190:15 243:15 disagreeing 83:22 191:9,11 194:7 195:2 226:15,19 differentiated 19:2 139:8 257:8 done 51:22 53:14 68:9 195:17 196:21 200:1 differentiating 246:5 disagreement 40:12 95:7 96:21 107:18 designing 201:19 differentiation 174:12 200:17 desire 35:8 156:14 67:16 108:1,2,7 112:4,8 174:15 disc 215:6 120:13 162:5 185:21 definitional 186:2 details 96:21 113:7 differently 129:16 discern 107:19 109:18 definitions 56:9,13 determination 91:17 193:13 185:11,14,15 186:22 160:22 164:9 Discombobulated 4:19 doubts 223:16,20 discomparable 129:19 down 15:21 19:14 192:12 determine 47:1 224:21 differing 182:15 discovery 100:4 230:16 40:17 77:9 104:14 255:10 difficult 59:7 70:22 degree 10:12 28:18,20 239:7 292:16 78:12,15 82:20 83:2 determined 82:19 152:7,8 166:10 170:6 145:18 152:15 187:7 86:18 97:18 111:22 93:13 130:9 138:22 248:21 discuss 215:17 216:8 195:21 212:3,20 234:6 237:9 267:1 139:5 239:12 264:18 difficulties 204:6 224:2,4 238:9 determining 14:20 delimiting 192:18 dig 12:19,20 discussed 15:9 80:16 280:2.5 229:5 230:5 279:20 193:8 detract 223:7 digital 1:6 4:1 6:17 download 18:21,22 delimits 195:18 13:14,15 17:4,11,14 discussing 30:14 36:17 41:20 65:2 develop 202:2,14 developed 43:17 45:3 190:10 66:10 67:11 70:1 deliver 109:8 206:21 17:16,22 18:11 19:6 delivered 129:6 206:3 148:10,10 205:5 22:22 24:7 32:17 discussion 138:7 206:9 104:17 105:4,15 35:14,17 36:2,9 37:1 226:11 286:7 116:12 124:4 141:15 206:4 207:1,7 285:9 discussions 15:6 79:7 179:2,13,19 180:10 delivering 207:22 developing 164:12 41:20 70:1 74:6,11 181:7 195:14 216:16 delivery 94:8 97:20 development 76:21 190:4,12,13 237:22 76:3 77:19,21 87:20 98:8 102:11 104:1 288:19 90:3 91:13 102:4,12 disproportion 132:3 downloaded 272:22 developments 43:11 dispute 30:2 123:18 downloading 65:8 66:6 105:4,15 109:20 104:17 105:4,15 110:9 125:3 deviates 265:16 116:12 124:4 141:3,5 downloads 13:16,18 131:1 demand 66:4 75:12 devices 66:15 141:15 142:1,9 179:2 disputes 57:19 186:21 19:7 24:7 32:17 126:2 127:4,12 dhandzo@jenner.com 179:13,19 180:13 disqualify 159:2 35:15,18 36:3,10,11 137:22 145:21,22 2:9 181:4,7 182:13 dissimilarity 10:4 36:13,16,22 65:12,16 146:10 167:22 168:1 dictate 178:16 183:10,19 201:1 distinct 107:7 66:15,19 74:7,12 distinguish 88:22 121:8 169:12 288:2 289:12 difference 10:20 11:2,4 219:21 220:11 76:3 77:20,21 87:21 121:13 207:16 90:3 91:13 102:4,12 289:16 24:3,4 26:11,14 221:13 222:12.18 228:20 229:9.21 distinguishable 136:14 141:11 142:1,9,9,11 demands 80:22 27:10,11 28:15,21 demographics 14:17,22 31:21 32:3 61:4 233:14 234:15 distinguished 107:21 179:8 180:12 182:9

90:21 91:3,12 133:16 281:7.9 213:17 earlier 32:9 42:18 183:11,19 222:3 84:17 108:18 129:17 empirical 40:10,14,15 244:9 examine 48:21 150:20 270:22 273:16,17 examined 7:21 30:17 162:6 209:12 210:1 40:17 establishes 52:2 91:6 dozens 192:4 examining 100:15 228:9 260:14 282:7 employed 8:5,7 26:21 estimate 127:12 223:21 Dr 7:10,16 8:5,16,21 example 15:22 43:5 encompasses 200:1 227:13 240:1 9:5,12 27:21 30:10 early 62:20 148:7 50:11 54:22 87:19 32:11 39:17,17 41:5 end 86:15 87:13,13 estimates 238:7 152:5 162:1 149:22 158:10 etc 124:6 273:3 91:14 113:5 116:15 42:10 45:19 46:22 earned 115:1 117:21 124:2 133:15 47:21 48:14,22 49:10 easily 133:17 145:19 161:20 202:17 241:7 evade 202:15 evaluate 162:7 165:20 137:19 172:21 ends 140:21 49:16 51:13,15 54:15 East 3:13 176:12 178:8,20 easy 179:8 engage 225:19 evaluated 162:12,16,18 55:18 64:21 90:2 195:17 196:8,13 92:6,16 102:5 109:7 Eaton 3:19 engaged 82:11 evaluates 158:8 112:4,10 113:2 121:2 econometrics 265:2 enhanced 198:14 evaluating 156:13 264:7 272:5 276:17 122:6 130:4 131:22 enough 19:2 28:7 96:20 163:21 277:7 280:10 282:3 economic 8:10 52:21 134:8.18 136:14.21 96:1 113:20 120:5 242:21 284:17 evaluation 49:11 287:13 143:11 147:2 185:5 125:14 126:11 enter 120:15,16 284:8 154:17 158:10 examples 18:14 25:13 189:21 208:20 201:11 entered 84:19 145:6 163:10 288:13 25:16 53:16 81:20 economically 285:22 151:1 153:7 155:15 even 24:6 37:19,20 114:10 129:16 211:21 221:4 225:5 225:12,18 226:10 economics 53:16 96:4 158:20 162:14 163:5 43:13 53:1 88:12 191:16 229:10 119:3 124:11.16 277:9 285:1 90:12 108:3 109:18 260:20 261:7,12 232:2 236:21 239:2 200:8 entering 155:2 157:1 110:11 131:11 134:9 262:3 241:1 245:1 254:15 economist 8:12 30:18 entire 35:16 37:6 103:8 149:15 157:8,17 exceed 149:1 266:15 270:3 272:18 95:22 113:3 166:19 201:10 162:2 172:13 198:3 Excel 15:18 274:3 275:4 281:11 282:2.8 283:4 285:17 **Educational 4:20** 201:11 204:1 216:21 199:18 200:14 except 52:16 120:19 285:20 286:11 effect 10:22 16:10 entirely 14:8 21:3 230:10 238:13 240:6 exception 137:11 draft 189:21 21:10 27:13 35:3.4 entities 82:10 143:3 250:5 256:21 274:7 exceptional 114:7 Exchange 2:2 7:15,20 drafted 190:6 38:6,15 39:7,12 163:15 290:4,8,20 drafting 190:3 191:1 58:15 86:22 153:12 entitled 90:7 105:5 event 102:11 111:15 60:10 84:11 89:7 entitlement 47:15 100:3 130:21 147:22 dragged 241:11 169:5,11 225:8,12 196:2 247:2 eventually 49:4 126:17 dramatically 152:16 226:5 235:11 242:17 106:12 159:21 160:16,20 161:12 162:4 188:19 drastically 152:16 242:20,20 260:22 entity 108:7 140:15 ever 81:10 draw 28:1 29:18 31:20 278:22 280:17,20 190:19 206:20 every 67:20 75:6 115:8 189:1,12,20 193:2 38:10,12 72:8 73:6 286:19 entry 109:22 289:6 290:10 196:17 197:1 200:17 204:8 211:15 220:19 117:4 152:21 155:2 effectively 82:3 130:12 Ephemeral 1:7 everybody 67:6 221:6 237:2 255:4 223:14 242:5 effects 10:19 38:14,17 equal 53:10 58:22 everyday 159:8 156:10 182:9 222:14 everyone 7:4 172:2 drawing 29:21 238:11 290:9 drawn 31:2 effort 127:12 266:6 176:19 Exchange's 55:21 59:11 60:18 160:12 drive 124:14 efforts 14:15 15:10 equation 81:17 89:5 everything 58:21 156:10 161:14 266:6 **DTRA 1:8** 169:22 equilibrium 283:21 exclude 18:10 excluded 132:1 229:13 Eisenberg 47:5 48:10 equivalent 38:8 222:2 evidence 11:13,21 12:2 duly 7:20 246:3 **DUMAS-EYMARD** 77:16 79:7,17 97:15 223:1 27:6 41:1 43:1,14 99:1,18 100:21 104:8 46:14 47:4 60:3 84:8 excludes 18:6 equivalents 220:1 3:3 excluding 66:12,14 eroding 141:3 86:16 131:9 138:14 during 34:3 35:18 213:22 195:14 176:8 190:5 220:1 Eisenberg's 47:12 erred 113:3 139:9,14 143:11 169:1,4,15 180:4 exclusion 187:12 68:15 99:7 104:6 especially 266:1 234:20 243:7 250:9 269:15 **ESQ** 2:3,4,4,5,5,10,17 189:9 213:12,16,18 251:19 252:4,13 110:2 111:1 112:9 242:4 260:12 261:9 Excuse 97:22 132:6 255:17 259:12 3:2,2,3,12,18,18 4:2 either 13:17 16:11 182:4 183:15 191:5 292:15 32:17 52:6 53:18 4:6,10,14,14,21 5:5,5 274:4 278:21 280:6 256:8 dynamic 285:4,6 56:7 58:2 70:3 77:21 5:6,6,7,17 evolve 83:4 excused 291:8 essential 253:19 exact 113:12 117:2,13 84:13 90:14 101:14 dynamics 288:6 exercise 53:5 224:13 111:19 165:20 201:4 essentially 14:18 15:9 133:4,12 179:16 **D.C** 1:2,15 2:8,13 3:5 222:2 233:19 273:10 15:12,17 21:18 23:12 198:22 219:16 220:7 exhibit 6:5 71:13,17 4:9 5:9 8:8 210:19 99:6,17 189:4,6 281:20 24:19 25:8 26:10 231:10 252:21 \mathbf{E} 27:20 36:1,13 37:9 exactly 10:17 15:14 193:16,22 211:16,19 elasticities 289:16 38:8,16 44:5 51:22 19:15 26:1 93:15 221:1,7 231:20 232:2 E 189:20 electronically 14:9 each 71:8 72:14 78:8 element 62:16 52:5 59:19 85:5 98:14 173:2 198:18 232:3 236:18,22 238:18 239:1 241:22 79:21 80:7 81:17,20 email 6:17 198:14 112:8 140:14 157:10 205:15 244:8 267:20 242:1 243:22 244:13 92:21 131:6 140:2 239:4,6 181:8 208:1 221:20 268:13,21 278:16 examination 7:22 28:8 244:14,16,20 245:2 154:17 155:4 158:8 embedded 128:3 134:4 241:10 265:8 285:21 land. 30:7 62:22 64:19 248:14 249:1 254:8 272:20 273:5,5,7,11 embodied 102:14 288:6 establish 161:2.15.18 146:22 151:12 185:3 254:12 255:1 257:20 286:4,17 288:3 289:7 **emerges** 154:16 289:8 emphasize 124:17 established 51:6 52:17 208:18 241:15 275:2 258:3 259:16,21

Ž.

260:5,11 266:22 269:22 270:5,12,16 272:19 exhibited 196:3 exist 113:13 152:10 existence 83:7,13,20 86:9 87:2,8 88:3 93:1 130:12 139:7 159:12 existing 133:6 134:1 139:16 144:22 210:5 exists 72:13 81:5 136:21 expect 38:13 39:6 50:22 53:4,7 58:8,12 75:11 79:2 134:6 138:2 177:20 261:10 265:20 272:6 284:16 287:8 288:5 289:13 292:9 293:2 expectation 221:15 290:11 expectations 111:20 149:18 152:22 153:10,13,17 154:21 158:15 expected 150:12 154:10 expecting 162:10 experience 74:22 185:11,13,18 186:4 215:10.12 expert 8:17,21 30:20 160:16 explain 20:10 28:8 112:13 167:18 explainable 265:9 explained 92:17 265:4 265:6 explains 49:15.18 explanation 29:6.13 96:7 200:19 201:11 explicitly 85:15 276:18 exploitation 108:12 **explored** 11:17.18 expose 241:13 express 102:20 expressing 167:12 expressly 261:21 extend 63:9 extent 13:3 16:14 29:5 29:20 30:2 38:14 58:2 69:5 101:12 105:13 127:9 143:4 191:18 225:22 261:8 272:1,4 286:18 292:12 extract 53:10 115:12 extraction 115:15 extrapolating 183:2 extremely 170:6 Eve 3:4 4:8

F F 222:9 230:17,18 232:17 279:20 face 140:3,6 faced 140:5 160:1 facility 217:8 fact 22:10 24:5 25:10 29:14 39:21 40:18 43:1,13 47:11 53:1,2 61:18 67:7 73:11 76:21 80:7 84:2,14 90:2 94:5,10 95:10 96:12 97:15 100:22 106:9 110:5,11 112:20 113:1,14 117:16,20 120:6 121:7 125:21 131:22 132:20 133:8 136:19 137:12,13 141:17 142:4,12 143:20,22 144:5 145:5 153:10 156:5,22 179:20 183:13 198:2 204:20 205:14,20 206:17 207:5 209:14 212:17 213:7 215:5 219:19 224:16 225:16 227:8 228:1 230:18 233:17 235:18 238:2 240:15 248:4 250:17 261:6 261:16 262:3 276:12 278:16 279:17 282:2 286:15 factor 10:15 152:1 154:17 161:6.13 162:1 164:21 215:8 factored 152:4 factoring 160:1 factors 39:10,14 89:18 154:1,4,10 157:20 160:21 161:6 162:5 162:13,19 209:5 289:17 facts 40:11 90:20 125:20 factual 91:6 failing 110:14 fair 108:15 112:3 116:19 118:10 134:18 136:9 148:4 161:3,15 165:19 167:10 185:20 223:10 276:19 fairly 186:22 faith 202:22 fall 16:5 191:8 familiar 39:21 40:2 43:16 50:11 94:4,10 97:14 105:1 110:5,11 130:10 144:4 153:4 170:2 179:12,20

198:2,5 199:5,7 205:14 206:17 207:5 292:11,17,21 familiarity 265:1 **Fancher** 187:11 far 11:20 27:5 32:9 48:20 87:6 116:7 137:20 150:12.13 205:10 265:6 fared 166:3 Farm 110:13 fashion 99:12 207:7 favored 155:16,19 156:2,11 favorite 44:1 favors 155:5 feature 127:10 199:2 217:20 features 198:15,19 fee 52:12 60:16 69:3 82:17,18,22 85:18 86:4 90:4,14 92:3,4,5 92:10,12 93:12,17,20 97:6 110:22 111:16 113:6 117:5.6 149:12 149:16 154:16 197:18 201:9 202:7 204:4 275:8 feel 65:20 242:2 fees 42:15 45:11 62:10 68:12 83:3,6 86:12 90:12,12 92:21 93:10 94:3 97:17 113:10 115:12 130:13,14 185:22 202:5 210:18 felt 241:9 few 114:13 139:18 168:16 237:22 289:22 290:4 fewer 35:7 252:11 268:1 272:8 Fielding 5:8 fifth 4:15 5:18 234:7 figure 69:2 98:17 103:20 104:20 111:7 180:11 204:5 figures 86:9 170:9 180:19 file 13:16 64:9 225:8,12 225:14,19 226:6,8 273:1 filed 63:19 160:18 291:14,21 292:4 filings 151:7 filling 292:4 film 143:21 144:12 final 128:6 129:15 134:11,13 Finally 156:16 find 12:16,21 24:2 31:4

72:16 76:11 138:18

139:10 143:15 153:16,19,20 169:14 179:7 214:17 268:14 269:10 findings 63:10.15 fine 81:14 180:9 258:21 finish 111:2 firm 8:8 12:11 221:11 292.20 firms 15:12 53:16 first 1:14 7:20 9:7,9 12:9,22 20:20 25:10 40:15 49:3 68:4,7 75:20 81:7 93:3 100:13 102:3 104:15 105:21 138:6 152:14 158:1 161:6 167:18 167:19 185:9 187:4 187:12 189:21 190:15 206:10,18 214:5 217:9 227:5 228:17,19 246:8,9 247:8,10 248:22 249:2.7 250:9 257:20 258:13 263:10 267:1 fit 144:9 203:13 five 18:7 19:15.15 42:17 49:21 199:1 253:5,22 267:2 270:22 271:8 flat 60:19 154:16 flexibility 95:13 284:17 284:20 flows 116:22 fluidity 284:17 focus 67:19 89:5 92:19 102:9 143:18 284:1 focused 67:6 123:9 153:9 focusing 121:3 follow 165:3 203:13 followed 7:12 242:19 follows 7:21 followup 291:1 footnote 109:3 214:8 forces 126:11 284:15 288:6 foregoing 102:20 forget 19:15 forgotten 212:11 form 6:9 30:20 38:13 193:17 229:20 248:21 formal 240:17 244:16 **formed 17:18** forming 148:7 forms 194:3 198:20 221:18 formula 205:2.6 formulas 205:8 forth 14:9 245:16

283:9 292:19 293:9 fortunately 292:1 forward 53:3 57:21 84:17 209:6,21 210:5 277:13 284:9 found 11:21 12:2,21 24:3 49:16 92:17 **foundation** 4:21 46:13 46:19 54:7 55:7,11 101:13 103:10 four 35:18 37:13 42:11 67:18 70:6,21 71:7,8 73:22 76:8 80:12 115:20 141:19 142:6 152:15 164:18 181:15 217:13 fourth 161:6 fraction 199:12 framework 52:1 Frank 129:10 frankly 64:1 280:16 free 16:13 24:11,14 25:5,8,11 124:13 233:4.12.15.20 234:19 235:1,4,7,11 235:21 236:3 242:15 246:13 252:18 253:14 254:17.19 255:11,14,22 256:10 256:12,18 257:2,22 258:5 259:7 260:16 260:21 261:8 262:5 262:11 273:1,16 280:13 281:1 FREEDMAN 2:4 Freundlich 3:12,12 Friday 63:17 friend 64:16 friends 64:18 from 12:8 15:14,16 17:4 21:9 24:11,14 25:8 27:7,8 28:2 29:18 31:2 33:1,4,4,5 33:5,8,21 35:12 36:20,21,22 38:2,11 38:12 40:18 43:1 46:4 52:10 53:10 55:2 56:11 58:20 61:2,6,20 64:9 67:8 68:14 79:2,21 80:8 80:12 81:2 83:4 88:9 89:1 95:9 96:12 97:14 99:18 100:20 107:12,21 115:11,13 116:3 117:8 124:12 126:3,4 127:7 130:15 134:20 135:6 136:17 136:18 137:20 138:3 139:9 141:16 142:7 142:12 143:12,13

144:8 145:4 148:17

groups 232:4,5,8,17 having 7:20 43:19 85:6 136:8 145:9 146:13 137:11 149:3 155:10 150:21 151:5 152:2 233:3,10,16 236:1 112:4.7 119:13 190:11 191:17,20 147:4 149:19 150:3 159:14 167:10 147:20 171:10 238:7,10 264:19,21 152:7,9 179:1,2 237:17 238:3,10,14 170:15 175:3 178:3 204:13 233:2 250:20 239:14,18 243:22 178:10 179:8 180:8 276:20 181:18,19 183:14,16 245:21 249:4 250:19 260:7 278:1 189:8 192:2 198:3 183:2.8 187:7.13 generally 13:10 14:1 258:13 headed 17:11 56:2 57:3,11 67:5 203:16,17 237:2 188:3 191:21 195:7 197:5 201:18 207:16 77:18 80:4 124:19 277:13 284:8 286:2 grow 290:11 hear 44:7 82:21 149:22 127:16 135:19,22 178:21 290:1 209:4 216:18,19 286:16 287:6,22 growing 170:10 heard 125:1 129:3 136:13 158:8 163:19 289:4 290:11 293:8 growth 169:8 219:1 221:10 223:7 gone 76:21 104:14 289:18 224:4,10 226:6,12 164:5 179:18,21 guarantees 190:22 guess 120:16 257:11 hearing 1:19 55:10 227:21 228:11 212:22 242:2 277:21 148:8 289:10 229:13 232:17 generate 269:14 good 9:22 15:1 43:5 guidance 191:10 293:1 help 261:14,17 234:19 235:1,4,7,21 generated 226:14 60:11 89:13 120:12 H generous 27:5 32:9 137:19 146:13 147:2 helpful 272:2 237:17 238:7,12 240:10,11,19 242:15 gents 291:9 147:3 152:8 189:15 half 17:10 26:7 248:7 helping 187:6 292:4 246:6,13 253:2 255:2 getting 75:8 129:18 193:12 202:22 208:3 250:2 256:17 helps 57:18 halfway 212:3 266:22 her 292:22 293:2 255:11,14,22 256:10 209:18 238:9 241:7 208:20,21 209:16,20 256:12,18 257:2,21 246:15 258:7 261:9 278:10 281:15 hallmark 134:19 hesitation 112:7,12 goods 12:14 197:13 135:18 high 139:1 174:1 198:8 258:5 260:16,21 Gil 291:15 gist 83:10 hand 16:12,14 84:11 198:10 202:4 218:20 262:5,11 263:9 276:21 give 15:22 32:7,19 Gotshal 4:3,7,11,15 123:22 127:7 131:3 higher 58:22 112:21 265:16 266:17 267:19 270:8 272:5 47:15 56:9 63:18 5:18 254:7 281:21 117:5 138:15 149:12 273:1.2 274:19 64:8 122:15 167:2 gotten 110:8 282:6 handed 221:4 232:1 173:14 174:20 206:2 236:21 245:1 254:22 276:20 277:13 280:7 204:19 205:3.19 govern 160:22 206:11 207:9 212:6 283:2 284:3.13 224:17 261:14.16 governing 94:6 270:5 220:3 274:7 277:6 handful 70:14 286:19 287:5 288:8 263:9,13 283:16 granted 30:4 284:22 highly 218:19 288:21 291:2 given 27:20 63:12 69:2 great 180:17 202:9 handle 61:21 159:17 Hills 3:14 front 9:6 100:19 131:13 greater 10:11 61:14 265:18 him 8:19 28:13 47:15 handled 109:15 full 44:7 75:21 107:8 138:11 146:5 158:14 68:1 78:13 92:11 54:9 81:9 91:1,1 handling 62:9 200:4 127:13 137:22 187:4 158:19 199:14 95:13 204:17 226:1,1 95:16,21 101:2,3,4 200:11 226:4 260:20 195:4 216:10 218:6 251:6 Handover 282:20 132:17 190:10 228:17 267:9 271:2,3 261:7,12 263:18 greater-of 205:2 Handzo 2:3 7:6,8,9,15 217:19 266:17 269:4 284:16 hires 132:21 fully 267:14 greater-than 205:6 8:1,16 9:4 21:16 function 277:4 **GREENSTEIN 2:10** 22:20 28:9,10 29:7 284:22 hold 52:14,15 fundamental 41:9 gives 15:18 25:13,16 29:13 30:8 46:17,18 holder 42:15,16 45:10 3:2 288:21 36:18 103:2,19 greenstein@soundex... 46:21 47:20 48:5,6 45:14 52:7,7 118:14 fundamentally 125:10 181:12 221:17 2:14 48:13 54:8,14 55:13 277:12,15 gross 37:9 38:4 186:11 55:17 57:14 62:17 holders 43:7 44:19 126:13 265:15 189:18,19,22 190:15 63:22 64:5,10 81:8 giving 35:3 56:13 61:11 50:2 52:18 further 11:17,19 88:17 90:19 91:4,10 holding 53:13 101:12 194:6 204:7 291:17 191:11 208:14 190:16,17 192:15 193:3 194:6 195:3,4 95:15 99:14 100:6,13 277:6 281:18 212:20 274:17 gleaned 152:2 go 29:17 62:19 65:4 101:9,10,17,22 103:6 holdout 53:6 282:11,18,21 195:18 197:5 259:22 260:3 holdup 282:5,5,9 future 57:19 58:5 75:5 81:12 86:10 grossed 37:12 hold-up 277:11 141:7 175:3 277:5 87:2 92:15,18 93:14 ground 215:18 274:21,22 275:3 281:3 282:22 291:3 hold-ups 281:13 284:19 94:3 99:12,14 122:1 grounds 46:13 group 14:10,12 20:15 291:11 hole 70:19 146:13 149:19 \mathbf{G} Hang 181:2 home 192:3,7,8 153:15,18,20 184:14 26:4 51:6,12 70:16 Hansen 178:13 homepage 37:22 G 4:14 5:5 192:5 193:10 203:17 81:3 110:12 222:9,9 Honor 7:10 8:16 27:16 gamesmanship 202:20 205:12 216:2,5 217:5 228:19 229:13 230:2 happen 53:4 87:7 93:15 97:1 158:15 28:10 29:12 30:6 220:2 244:8 252:7 232:10,17 233:17,17 203:20 254:1 284:20 288:12 234:8,9,12,14,22,22 263:20 48:4,6 62:18 63:22 **GARY 2:10** happened 45:5,8,13 99:9 103:6 208:17 gather 14:21 185:17 goal 225:5 235:3,6,12,19 236:1 54:11,17 244:14 253:13 gave 65:11 80:3 120:19 goes 29:5 113:9 190:22 236:13 237:4 238:8 happening 52:10 54:21 259:19 266:11 168:19 189:18 going 16:22 26:18 238:12 244:2 249:3 224:18 229:9 245:17 27:12 32:3 46:12 250:5,12,17,22 251:3 happens 20:12 273:8 272:10 274:14,16,20 259:1 268:6 51:11 52:4 53:3 54:4 252:17 253:14 286:14 275:1 282:15,19,22 hard 58:3,21 72:16 283:16 291:3,4,5,11 gears 39:16 54:9 55:6 57:21 58:6 254:16,16,16 255:3,7 general 2:10 20:11 82:18,21 93:15 291:13,19 292:14 62:15 64:15 87:10 255:9 258:15 266:20 270:7,7,21 279:10,15 129:21 203:8 HONORABLE 1:22 31:19 72:7 73:5 92:15 96:22 100:4 hardly 192:18 1:22.23 100:14 119:8 123:13 101:22 104:17 279:20 280:7 123:14 129:20 130:1 114:12,13 125:10,16 groupings 269:8 Harvard 3:17 hopefully 63:8 65:22

integrated 107:8 isolating 125:18 hour 177:4 205:16,22 incidental 202:9 228:2 267:2 268:7 intellectual 119:10 issue 11:22 47:14 48:21 hours 290:21 include 97:8 98:20 270:21 271:1,2,13 59:3.6 62:8 64:15 household 222:13 102:7 176:10,14,16 individually 144:1 120:20 128:16 67:22 92:2 94:16 185:19 244:5 176:18 192:16.17 286:18 intended 235:9 286:10 97:11 143:5,7 144:6 198:14 215:5 249:21 individuals 222:11 housekeeping 291:14 160:5 168:14 175:12 Houston 3:9 262:6.8 223:18 224:10,17 interact 205:7 hundredths 34:17 included 18:14 58:6 230:3,19 231:4,7 interacted 250:18 178:12 184:9 186:2 hypothetical 128:18,19 interactive 9:19.21 190:10 204:10 59:12 80:7 101:1 232:16,17 233:11 105:16 187:1 193:1 236:13 237:11 238:4 10:10 11:6 16:11 205:20 206:11,18 129:4,9,22 135:14 243:8 244:3 249:20 17:18 18:1,17 20:16 208:1 212:13,17 167:17.21 168:12 216:21 229:18 230:2 250:14 21:1 26:8,12 27:1 238:1 245:17 246:14 171:3,14,18 172:9,10 231:5 233:3,11,11 172:12,18 173:1,17 246:18,19 247:12,17 indulgence 184:11 28:15,18,20 41:17 260:18 284:11 56:18.22 65:1.20 issues 15:8 40:15,15,17 173:19.20 174:2 247:21 249:17 industries 112:16.19 197:22,22 198:1 250:13 262:11 279:6 industry 48:1,8,9 89:21 67:4.8 68:5 74:15,16 51:14,19 59:4 121:14 112:20,22 114:1,2 199:15 281:12 279:17 76:2 81:6 82:8,11,15 123:15 187:7 hypothetically 37:11 includes 27:17 59:15 115:5.6 121:15 85:19 86:6 93:3,5 item 262:20 107:3 144:15 98:20 103:4.21 123:13.17 124:12 94:2 164:9.19 165:1 iTunes 124:4 141:15 107:14.15 111:9.11 127:1 129:20 130:2 165:2 191:18 194:13 178:9,21 179:3,13 I . 125:12 176:10.21 147:20 148:5 149:13 205:8 213:4,13,14 187:17 188:2,5 icon 192:5 191:15 197:20 232:4 149:19 150:2 151:4 218:18 219:6,9 I-N-D-E-X 6:1 idea 118:4 165:16 246:22 276:1 152:6,9 161:7 162:2 221:16 222:18 i.e 102:18 166:2 including 10:2 12:14 infer 95:9 96:12 167:6 223:11 224:9,22 ideal 38:5 41:17 46:6 47:6 71:8 167:10 229:3,7,11,19 230:4 J 1:22 2:5 5:17 inference 18:4 95:22 231:8 233:2,9 235:13 identical 114:6 190:20 273:16 identification 71:18 242:16 247:3 251:3 Jaffe 41:5 48:22 49:10 281:14 96:20 inflation 159:7 49:16 92:7,16 112:4 194:1 221:2 231:21 income 137:19 279:6 236:19 238:19,22 incomes 96:18 influence 126:11 134:7 interactivity 10:5 112:11 113:3 143:11 244:21 254:13 260:9 154:11 incorrect 123:8 25:15 286:11 270:1 increase 24:6 61:21 influenced 271:19 interchangeable Jaffe's 39:18 51:15 identified 40:16 203:21 266:3 286:5 272:12 285:8 121:19 125:5,9 121:2 130:4 132:1 222:6 250:20 257:12 increased 45:9 61:5 influences 91:19 interchangeably 134:8 136:14,21 282:3,8 285:20 identify 9:7 influential 108:19 122:14,15,19 increases 186:18 identifying 278:10 **JAMES 1:22** increasingly 141:6 Info 6:18 Intercollegiate 3:16 ignore 125:20 January 84:21 incur 157:10 **information** 35:4 36:22 interest 163:7 indeed 60:22 157:17 JARED 2:4 ignored 92:7 37:3 107:11 133:20 Interesting 219:18 ignores 41:2 168:11 271:22 International 5:2 Jenner 2:6 148:14,14 152:2 ignoring 113:3 internet 13:6 14:4 16:3 jockeys 215:6 Independence 1:14 154:18 155:4 166:14 immediately 178:7 Joel's 129:1 independent 68:9 69:9 166:17 169:20 23:18 198:9,10 join 291:15 271:20 219:11 225:3 227:20 77:11 80:21,22 83:7 225:13 226:1,2 impact 161:7 277:3 Joseph 5:5 21:13,14 84:7 151:12 162:21 242:10 262:18 287:20 implemented 57:21 163:4,11 164:17 infringement 110:6 interpret 159:17 173:9 27:15,16 28:11 29:10 implicated 104:12 169:10 212:18 initial 56:20 64:11 interpreted 157:20 29:12 30:5 208:15,16 105:21 independently 68:13 Initially 44:3 interpreting 261:17 208:19,21 220:17 implication 20:4 75:17 innocent 203:22 interval 240:14 221:3 231:16,22 implications 49:13 indicate 109:3 245:19 input 121:5 123:11 intrusive 203:19 236:20 238:20 imply 102:21 264:9 264:6 124:18,22 125:14 invest 140:1,4,7 241:16 244:12,22 importance 124:17 indicated 26:20 37:14 investigation 69:10 253:12,18 254:5,7,14 127:17 128:6 129:5 247:13,18,22 277:19 129:15,21 134:10,14 77:11 90:10 151:13 259:19 260:1,13 important 43:3 51:7 indicates 223:5 134:15 190:8 191:1 invoke 102:1 266:8,9,14 269:16 70:10 73:13 74:18 88:22 92:1 139:13 indication 18:13 21:20 276:9,16,20 invokes 111:4 270:2 272:9,17 147:12 154:8 162:1,3 23:20 137:6,7 169:9 inputs 135:11 involve 275:20 274:13,16 282:13,14 203:7 204:16 214:20 262:4 264:8 inquiry 150:15 involved 15:7 226:19 282:18 291:5,19 288:4 289:8 292:20 indications 16:21 insofar 27:17 275:21 Joseph's 277:20 Imported 4:19 indifferent 137:1 287:9 instance 129:15 involves 106:5 109:9 JR 1:22 indirect 191:22 instances 62:1 115:9 in-stream 195:9 judge 1:22,22,23 7:3,8 impossible 138:20 impression 246:16 indirectly 39:9 190:19 116:16 136:10.11 IP 185:17,21 7:14 8:20 9:2 21:13 191:2,13 192:7,8,11 instead 43:20 143:11 iPod 178:20 179:4,6,7 21:15 22:3,9,17 imputed 59:19 27:15 28:9 29:3,10 inappropriate 112:10 196:15 197:22 179:10 187:17,18 196:16 30:1 46:17,20 47:18 199:16 individual 114:3 institutional 113:7 188:1 Inc 2:15 3:1.11.17.17 143:14.18 166:21 124:9 285:10,13 irrelevant 140:13 48:5,11 54:12 55:9 55:15 57:7 62:19 184:6 285:22 4:2,19,20 5:2 189:12 217:1 222:1,4,6,21 instructive 42:21

63:4 64:3,6,11 88:20 90:22 91:8 95:19 96:6 100:17 101:9,15 103:12,15 119:18 132:7,12 146:15,20 166:10 182:2,5 184:12,14,18 185:1 189:5,10,13,15 208:15 241:1,14 253:4,10,17,21 254:4 260:4 266:7,12 272:14 274:18,21 281:5 282:13,20 283:1,3,18 285:3,14 285:15,17 286:21 287:12 288:8 289:18 290:22 291:1,6,9 292:8 293:2,5,9,11 judging 220:4 judgment 113:20 170:19,21,22 iudgments 240:20 iudicial 115:17 just 7:11 9:6,12 15:18 20:21 22:3 23:11 27:7 30:9,14,19 32:14 34:22 35:2,16 37:7,15,19 41:22 44:5,9,14 47:6 51:18 54:8,17 56:2,21 57:2 60:19 64:1,7,21,22 66:2,12 67:3,6 68:14 68:16 69:8 75:17 76:4 77:9 78:16 81:12 90:10 91:2 97:7 98:3 100:6 101:17,18 103:7 105:12 109:6 111:2,8 113:4,18 115:19 125:1 128:22 129:14 132:3 133:11,17 139:12 141:9,10 142:7 148:7 149:5,22 151:11 154:20 162:11,20 169:13 176:20 177:10 181:22 185:5 188:13 192:21 200:18 201:19 202:12 203:15 204:22 209:20 210:4,10 211:9 213:15 224:2 230:7 232:1 237:2 241:22 242:1 245:1 245:14 246:22 251:9 251:11 252:12 254:22 270:3 281:8 281:11,12 283:3 285:7 287:12 288:22 justifiable 31:3

K K 3:18 4:22 5:8 **KARYN 5:5** keep 52:9 98:18 130:9 167:8 keeping 61:13 **KENNETH 3:12 4:2** kenneth.steinthal@... 4:5 Kenswil 213:22 Kessler 7:12 291:12 kev 49:20 202:13 kfreundlich@earthli... 3:15 kind 9:13 46:14 72:7 73:5 115:17 154:14 193:5 241:2 260:17 288:11 kinds 13:10 44:10 80:7 81:18 228:12 Kirby 291:22 292:3,5 knew 260:15 279:11,21 know 13:19 14:1,11,15 15:4 17:20 18:20 20:22 21:2 28:4,7 32:2 44:18 68:5,20 76:20 77:3 82:14,16 88:5 90:1,8 95:6 96:20 98:3,4,10,17 105:7,9 106:14,15 107:1,3 109:11,15 111:6,8,11 116:9 121:3 131:15 132:13 138:13,17 139:12 150:4,9,11 154:3,7,9 155:12,22 156:9 162:12 165:4,7,10,12 167:5,9,9,15 170:14 176:10,20 177:2,5 179:15 190:11 194:9 198:18,22 202:19 203:3 210:14,16 211:6 216:20 217:7 217:12 227:3,5 229:20 231:7 232:19 234:17 245:16 251:21 256:22 257:8 257:18 258:16 259:12 263:20 265:18 267:17,18,20 273:8 275:14 279:7 279:18 287:18 knowing 96:1 278:10 knowledge 110:19

known 50:16 90:20

label 101:7 117:16

196:8,10 206:19

132:13

L 4:2

242:14 243:1,4 248:7 253:13.15 255:12.17 258:15 263:22 264:1 264:13 274:4 278:15 285:18 291:21 lastly 36:19 later 81:12 191:12 192:12 291:16 Launchcast 178:22 198:15 199:9,14 200:2 Law 94:6 laws 124:16 lawsuits 110:6 lawyers 64:18 lav 46:19 lead 39:9 58:21 202:4 leading 21:14 57:6 154:14 leads 186:17 280:19 lead-up 67:20 learn 43:5 learned 15:11 64:16,17 64:18 77:1 79:6 LEARY 2:17 least 21:3 63:18 111:12 120:11 176:19 199:1 223:14 237:18 239:10 249:18 250:1 250:2 251:13 252:2 256:11 257:10,18 258:6 261:3 289:19 leave 63:9 64:15 97:16 100:11 led 21:22 Lee 7:13 left 156:21 237:9 left-hand 72:4,11 120:4

207:22 208:2 213:21

106:10 131:1 193:12

language 157:16 191:3

large 12:11 14:5 15:18

70:16 73:12 142:19

163:14 165:2 179:16

219:17 227:5 288:22

193:6,7 196:18

labels 46:3 55:1 65:20

67:8 76:8 105:22

206:1

289:2

largely 64:16

245:19

larger 60:8 220:7

last 13:22 21:8 22:14

54:5 55:19 64:17

163:12 200:21

203:16 213:11

216:10,10 218:16

230:20 237:12 239:8

142:2 147:19 157:16

LARSON 4:10

122:4 legal 68:20 92:8 106:15 107:1 111:6 115:16 185:12 legally 109:16 legs 61:16 length 238:9 267:9 271:2,3 less 18:7 19:9,19 20:1,6 28:22 51:6 58:6 129:4 176:11,22 177:4 203:19 214:22 229:14 231:13 232:11 238:14 267:14 lesser 10:12 less-than-one-year 20:21 lest 215:18 244:15 let 12:9 20:10 23:10 30:9 42:10 46:18 50:4 54:12 55:18 71:11 76:9 96:9 99:21 103:7 120:6 132:16 133:18 134:9 135:3 138:9 139:18 141:7 152:17 155:7 156:1 157:15 166:8 171:13 172:22 184:8 187:10,15 192:19 193:6 211:11 213:10 214:2 218:5 220:17 221:8 224:2 235:22 238:21 242:11 253:16 254:7 259:15 let's 33:7 40:14 50:1 62:19 65:22 67:17 68:4 81:16 82:7 89:4 89:5 92:20 93:2 94:3 99:5 116:14 122:1 160:7 165:3 167:8 179:17 180:7 188:18 190:14 193:10,15 194:21 196:20 197:21 198:1 202:12 205:12 215:16 252:17 254:4 266:20 269:16 287:8 level 10:20 11:2 112:18 114:8,9 115:1 136:20 138:5 237:19 239:11 levels 82:5 110:22 151:22 liability 32:5 118:5 Librarian's 98:13 **Library 1:2,14** licensable 97:19 license 5:1,4,16 46:7 50:7 52:11 53:21 70:7.11 76:17 79:20

79:22 80:8,9 81:21

82:2 83:13 84:15.20 85:4 87:18,20 88:3,7 88:15 90:15.16.17 93:1 94:5,14,19 95:11,14 96:3,15,16 97:3 104:21 105:22 106:2,10 115:12 129:7 130:13,14 143:20,22 144:17,20 144:20 145:6 150:18 157:8 186:13 281:21 licensed 106:19 107:2,4 licensee 70:22 71:5 80:18 93:9 111:15 116:3 197:3 200:22 201:2 licensees 70:5 115:13 186:21 licenses 67:21 69:10 72:6 74:14 76:19 77:12.18 80:12 98:7 102:17.22 123:16 130:4 131:8 144:7 185:12 licensing 82:9 124:2.3 131:2 136:4 138:22 144:22 145:1 licensors 186:21 **Liebowitz** 214:8 224:5 224:16 225:5,13,18 Liebowitz's 226:4 lies 175:4 lifetime 161:18 light 80:14 99:9 160:6 261:12 291:18 like 63:15 76:2 100:6 108:5 159:6 185:9 194:16 202:21 206:22 223:8 258:20 259:20 269:3 278:22 283:6 289:17 likelihood 179:1 likely 214:22 215:14 250:3 limit 58:19 84:6 limitation 190:21 limited 69:5 75:22 192:16,17 193:1 269:5 limits 82:4 line 20:6 22:21 72:5 76:14 77:9 103:8 120:3 122:4 234:7,9 lines 23:4 152:15 209:3 link 32:20 34:15 links 35:6 list 104:19 260:19 262:21 listed 80:6 81:18 90:10 listen 16:2 25:3,4 35:8

49:5 176:11,15,16

112:11 113:22 114:2 41:6.17.18.19.20.21 43:4 49:21 50:9 91:17 93:5 94:7 177:3,13 188:11 235:1,3,6,21 236:2,3 119:11 125:19.19.19 96:14 109:8 123:10 41:21 43:7,9,11,12 52:14,16 54:22 57:11 43:14,17,18 45:19,21 70:5 71:6 78:6 80:15 243:18 262:21 263:4 126:9 130:3 141:6.9 143:21 169:22 178:2 47:1,5 48:15,17,18 87:6,7 92:7,17 141:10 143:5 151:19 178:6 204:22 209:6 listened 176:19,21 48:22 49:2,10,13,16 104:16 112:5,11,14 222:12 233:4,11,13 178:5 179:17 188:18 217:10.13 277:10 49:19 54:2,10,16 113:17 114:10 119:9 233:18 234:14,18,19 190:14 192:14 278:1 235:19 243:9,16 193:12,14 194:15,17 magnitude 220:8 60:4 67:21 68:10,18 125:10 128:7 129:7 main 3:8 265:16 69:11,15,19 70:1 136:21 169:10 186:7 244:4 245:8,12 246:2 194:18,21 223:8 71:1 75:17.19 76:8 275:7 283:7,12,20 246:20 247:6 252:18 234:6 237:9 239:9 maintain 14:21 major 56:5 70:19 73:8 76:16 77:2,4,8,12 285:6,11 287:22 254:17,19 256:11,15 243:21 248:13 73:10 76:8 79:19 78:14,19 79:3 80:11 288:3,13,18 289:16 258:9 273:3 255:12 266:20 278:5 listener 32:20 34:16,17 279:10 283:8 284:3 80:9 164:19 80:17,19 81:4,6 82:1 market's 286:12 majority 200:13 82:5 86:14,17 87:12 marking 253:5 36:7,16 38:2 215:21 284:13 288:17 listeners 25:1 32:18 looked 12:5 16:9 23:14 majors 71:9 78:8 79:21 93:20 97:2 98:15 Marks 148:18 markups 288:1 33:10 34:2,8,11 36:4 28:17,19 29:13 30:18 79:22 80:12 194:4 107:12 109:18 113:4 Massachusetts 2:18 147:16 175:17,19,20 32:12 48:22 73:7.8 make 14:16 39:11 113:8,9,14,21 114:3 175:22 176:3 177:3 75:19 112:15 113:15 50:17 52:8 59:11 114:7,9,15 115:12,15 massive 9:5 master 76:15 90:4 177:16 251:18 114:22 115:9 123:3 65:22 66:13 68:16 121:3,9,11,16,18 70:12,22 95:22 122:2 91:14 94:3 96:18 255:21 256:6.10.22 128:8 137:14 151:3 122:7,9,10,11,17,18 97:4 98:19 113:20 listening 23:18 25:9 228:19 230:9 237:17 133:17 139:21 123:3,4,5,7,20,22 130:14 131:3 132:4 34:1 37:16,20 38:20 269:2.7 142:16.18 143:6 124:13,15,19 125:6,7 176:4 177:20 178:21 looking 20:14.15 25:22 155:7 156:12 192:19 125:16,17,18,21 133:1 136:6 137:19 126:3,5,7,9,12,14,17 188:4 215:10.11.12 27:8 29:15 30:21 202:1 203:9,22 138:13 143:8,12 144:18 145:1,10 228:12 231:13.14 34:19 48:15 73:3 211:13 212:21 127:5,7,10,16 128:13 274:9,11 235:11 237:11 75:12 78:21 87:5 235:22 246:15 134:19 135:4,7,8,14 98:14 101:4 103:1,19 283:14 290:13 match 14:17 242:14 252:20 135:18 136:4,14,15 253:14 256:18 257:1 107:8 112:9 114:3 maker 287:2 137:5,7,19 138:5,8 material 270:7 makes 51:5 101:4 math 181:22 257:21 258:5,10 120:12 123:5 125:9 138:13,22 139:10 **MATT** 5:6 168:10 203:8 141:1,13 142:18 259:6,6 261:22 127:1 134:17 151:17 143:1,8,12,13 144:22 matter 1:5,18 63:2 90:1 making 29:16 34:9 262:12 273:18 153:13 164:22 165:1 173:21 180:3 182:16 38:18 41:8,9 75:17 152:15 158:19,21 96:4 119:3,8 120:5 listing 192:22 123:14 132:5 146:18 lists 195:8 205:10 218:12 223:8 81:9 141:18,18 142:5 159:9 160:7,7 161:3 142:12 151:7 219:3 161:11,16,22 163:15 162:16 179:10 literature 214:6,12,13 223:14 230:6,7 235:15 237:2 248:15 240:20 284:21 164:10 165:4,7 166:3 184:21 200:7 212:17 214:17 254:21 279:14 280:3 **MALONE 3:18** 166:3 167:22 168:9 212:18 253:8 280:16 litigating 156:15 157:1 280:11,17 283:11,19 169:8 170:20 173:8 280:22 287:20 289:4 litigation 95:18 110:13 Manges 4:3,7,11,15 290:17 291:14 157:11 283:21 284:3,5 5:18 173:10,12,21 174:3,8 174:9,10,22 175:5 293:14 285:11 little 14:14 64:8 118:19 manifest 177:9,12 179:13 183:2 197:11 MATTHEW 3:18 looks 41:5 221:12 many 10:3 20:17,19 163:15,16 187:16 maximize 142:22 143:4 33:15 50:6,6 81:10 205:7,8 208:6 213:4 188:6 202:1 212:20 259:4 213:8 226:16,17 286:17 288:11 283:16 losing 61:16,17 112:14,21 142:20 274:5 277:4 282:3 maximizes 140:16 Live365 4:1 lost 181:20 145:20 169:7 174:13 283:5,21 284:6,13,14 maximizing 140:15,18 lot 15:11 19:14 23:12 177:2 198:18 199:6 LLC 4:19,19,19,20 may 37:14 67:8 120:6,7 220:10,13,14 223:6 284:16,17 286:8 27:9 28:11 43:10 165:11 287:7 288:3,22 289:1 139:2 141:14 143:22 223:12,21 249:19 LLP 3:12 4:3,22 5:18 73:7 137:21 151:3 177:18 185:14 283:4 253:14 263:14 289:3,7,8,12 290:19 144:1 154:16 176:21 LM-414 1:13 290:20 178:16 208:22 Logic 3:11 love 200:19 MARGARET 5:6 low 173:22 181:13 marketplace 41:11 276:13 277:21 marginal 80:20 118:22 logical 20:3 56:16 58:11 60:9 282:14 291:15 long 19:12 21:4 102:6 lower 137:16 141:14 119:5,5 120:10,14,14 149:12 154:5 161:2 mark 6:5 99:5 189:3 62:3 70:9 79:10 83:4 maybe 22:4 181:22 141:2 143:10 159:16 201:22 258:7 188:8,10 243:12,19 161:15 173:5,13 193:15 265:6 84:7 91:21 136:12 174:21 marked 71:15 99:10 139:16 145:1 154:18 McQuillan 6:16 255:10 256:22 lucrative 212:2,6,9 189:8 193:16,20 154:20 158:2,6,18 mean 57:1,2 80:1,19 283:21 284:4 longer 23:20,21 61:12 lump 154:14 155:3,5,9 220:21 221:7,22 159:15 160:2 163:20 106:22 115:4 123:14 164:5 165:20 167:6 124:2 132:11 140:19 256:15 271:8 155:13,15 156:5 231:18 236:16 longitudinal 22:6 162:13 238:16,22 244:18 174:13 175:4.6 142:7 146:9 148:7 254:10 260:8 269:20 276:22 284:15 286:2 151:15 178:19 long-run 140:19 M market 9:20,22 10:6,10 288:5 190:16 191:14 look 41:14,16,19 43:4 193:11 255:21 M 2:5 6:3 10:10,12,13 11:7,9 markets 10:22 11:14 66:20,22 71:12 72:1 274:11 made 33:3,11 37:8 50:5 17:19 24:19,20,21 31:21 41:2,5,14,16 76:9 85:1 87:16 meaning 22:7,9 150:5 88:15 101:2 102:6 50:17 72:7 73:6 37:6,12 40:11,19 41:22 42:17,19 43:2

50:2.22 52:3.9.19 174:19 205:22 228:4 290:10 207:19 212:1,6,8 261:11.14 262:4 mind 17:1 42:20 61:13 215:14 219:21,22 53:11.14.18.21 55:4 56:6 59:12.15.15 meaningful 240:12 162:16 273:21 220:11 221:14 60:7,16 61:2,18 means 39:10 70:13 minds 95:17 222:13 227:13 228:21 230:8 231:1,6 65:10 66:4,4,8,9,11 195:5 264:18,20,22 minimum 145:11 69:15 75:8,13,22 286:16 minute 123:10 176:17 231:14 232:12 meant 66:9 102:7 184:11 188:18 233:19 234:16 244:5 76:7 79:5 81:16,20 82:8 98:8 99:2 105:2 214:12 260:16 203:16 205:13 250:3,13,15,21 251:14 252:3 256:16 105:19 106:1,5,12,19 measure 61:1 208:7 251:15 257:3,5 258:10,12 107:14,15 108:9,12 220:5 239:21 241:18 minutes 62:21 114:13 259:7 276:20 279:12 108:22 109:8,20 242:7 176:11,15,17,19,22 mechanical 68:21 177:10 184:16 253:6 279:22 283:16 284:4 110:7,9,12,14 113:13 90:15 94:13,19 95:4 253:22 285:3 114:6 115:2 116:22 97:15 105:12 missed 22:4 233:6 morning 26:19 62:20 117:15,19 118:1,6 mechanisms 111:14 missing 72:21 120:17 67:5 175:13 177:22 123:4,13 125:3,6,7 253:18 197:6 291:12,18 125:11 127:16 Mecra 8:8,10 media 4:1,21 5:11,12 model 125:14 mortar 124:3,6 128:22 137:10 141:4 111:22 195:15 modeled 205:6 most 32:18 38:13 39:4 141:10 142:13 143:21 144:6 145:19 modifying 84:4 51:18,21 65:5,7 198:20 moment 274:13 282:14 120:13 154:8 190:12 145:22 146:10 meet 149:1 Meg 292:1 Monday 1:16 225:19 147:15 178:17 179:8 Member 2:15 money 19:6 41:13 58:7 mostly 265:2 187:13,20 188:9,11 memory 65:5 189:15 113:2 290:8 motion 30:4 191:17,20 192:5,7 202:13 monies 190:17 195:5 move 27:16 54:4 195:6 196:7 197:16 139:20 272:9 287:2 mention 154:1 219:18 196:5 198:16 199:18,20 200:5 201:13,16,18 mentioned 32:11 36:8 monophonic 44:4 288:9 290:2 36:19 42:1,17 51:13 Montana 287:10,13,15 moved 64:7 202:1,8,10,12 203:1 movie 49:17 50:1,6 206:2 208:8,10 215:7 66:3 177:22 month 18:8 175:20 menu 72:2 176:1,8,12,15,20,22 51:7,7 127:22 128:11 219:21 220:11 221:13,19 222:12,18 MERCA 8:9 177:4,11 180:12,18 129:10 131:14 mere 87:1 127:17 133:7 133:12 134:2 138:18 223:11 224:21 225:4 183:5 202:12 222:14 226:15,16 228:13,20 merely 121:5 158:20 228:22 234:16 244:5 139:10 145:4,7,19 movies 40:22 41:6 229:9,21 233:9,14 mess 66:1 279:12 monthly 18:5 197:18 234:15,19 235:1,4,7 method 133:5 238:5 48:19 methodology 6:18 MS-529 3:8 235:11,20,21 236:2 201:9 226:22 227:17 months 19:15,16,16 much 18:4 27:12 28:22 242:15,16,18 243:2 81:10 168:16 180:22 51:6 107:19 113:1 243:13 245:8,12,20 241:11 methods 227:22 117:5 131:18 137:15 246:11,12 247:5,9 183:21 234:20 139:10 167:2 177:12 249:2 250:19 251:4 Michael 7:16,18 8:4 247:11,14,18 248:1,3 microeconomics 8:18 179:12 229:21 252:5 254:20 255:11 248:7 249:9,11,14,18 8:22 249:19 250:8,9 256:1 232:19 234:17 255:22 256:10,12,18 Microsoft 4:1 256:12,15 257:4,6,10 263:11 271:13 257:2,21 258:5 260:16,20 262:5,11 middle 73:4 76:12 257:17 258:1 263:15 278:11 279:7,11,21 283:10 286:13 287:9 267:1 270:22 271:8 140:21 143:9,10 263:22 264:1,1,13 271:14 272:22 273:1 270:13 271:15,19 287:15 289:11 144:9 180:11 might 10:11 35:7 50:16 multiple 135:5,5,15,16 273:2,3,18 274:9 272:1 multiplying 37:13 275:18 279:1 280:9 need 51:9 63:16 74:7 56:11 58:4 76:21 Moon 129:11,11 more 11:8 19:9,20 23:1 181:3,6,11,13 280:12,13,18 281:19 74:13 76:16,18 106:7 83:9,9 86:13,13 music 5:1,4,16 6:17 290:1 116:18 117:14 87:11 131:7,17 137:4 23:14,17,17 27:5 28:11 29:20,21 32:9 10:4 12:6,14,14 13:4 musical 40:19 42:2,9 137:20 157:10,18 161:11 needed 32:10 40:20 162:4 172:19 176:16 42:7,9 61:17,18,18 13:5,14,14,17 15:20 42:16 44:16,19 45:14 41:12 45:6 52:3 53:1 45:20 46:6 48:16 227:9 229:15 265:7 63:13,20 77:3,15 16:3,11,16 17:4,11 53:2 188:10 17:14,16,22 18:12,15 50:5,19 52:7 53:5,9 265:19 267:13 78:20 79:4 90:7 needs 27:6 109:8 278:15,16 287:18 94:12 100:14 113:1 53:22 54:19 68:2 19:3 21:1,21 22:2,22 23:18,19,22 24:1,11 69:3,6 70:15 82:10 negotiate 158:3 Mike 8:8 113:19 115:19 85:18,20 86:4 87:18 negotiated 46:1 58:10 **Miller 3:19** 131:19 134:14 137:6 24:14 25:8,13 26:12 58:14 84:14 85:2,21 million 76:4 79:1,13,13 137:12 141:18 142:5 26:13,16 32:21 35:8 88:10 90:3,4,5,12,13 90:16 91:16 98:15 142:12 156:7 162:2 37:2,3,19,21,21 91:22 92:4,11,21 175:16 180:21 93:7 94:7 97:5.10 131:17 148:15,21 181:10,17 183:7,20 164:5 165:13 167:5 38:20 39:5 40:1,21 184:2,5 290:15 168:2,10,13 171:21 41:6,20 44:7,14 46:1 99:4 104:10 105:14 149:10 154:5 211:3,8 46:4 48:18 49:3,11 108:11 109:1,9,21 284:16 millions 142:20 210:10 177:10,12,13 200:1

111:5 112:16,21 113:2 114:18 117:5 118:11,15 121:5 122:7,19 123:11 124:18,22 125:12,13 126:4 127:17 128:2,6 128:13 129:4,14 130:13 133:1,9 134:5 136:5 138:11,15 139:3 143:14,16 145:7 164:4 185:16 201:2 275:8,21 276:3 276:8,14,19 277:2,5 277:12 281:14 Musicmatch 166:1 MusicNet 165:5,8,21 MusicNow 165:15,21 must 81:21 141:6 mvyradio.com 4:19 myself 31:15 119:14

name 8:3 namely 40:10,21 59:17 60:15 288:6 Napster 65:10 66:3 165:11,21 narrow 121:18 narrower 58:17 121:11 122:18 123:5 narrows 58:18 nascent 147:20 148:5,6 148:9 149:13 National 2:15 4:2 5:1,4 nature 69:10 70:21 77:12 106:14 108:17 120:21 124:9 133:12 169:16 284:7 near 148:10 necessarily 71:2 75:4 82:6 134:12 135:11 183:13 206:16 269:4 287:16 necessary 44:10,12,15 102:22 203:9 242:10 288:10 290:18

277:4

negotiating 58:16 negotiation 58:11 82:17 150:5 154:14 156:6 157:21 158:3,7 negotiations 85:10 115:18 147:21 159:20 negotiators 157:18 neighborhood 180:21 neither 240:2 242:14 net 35:7 65:11 66:11 117:10 never 18:2 172:22 200:13 289:4 nevertheless 290:2 new 4:12,12,16,16 5:19 5:19 43:10 58:4,20 140:2 217:20 243:2,5 247:2 248:5 249:17 250:6 256:6 287:16 292:10 newer 151:19 246:6 next 7:16 22:21 89:21 104:15 195:22 196:1 209:22 210:6 211:22 212:8 214:3,3,19 216:10 243:3,5 246:10 267:5 271:6 293:15 Nokia 43:21 non 25:14 28:19 157:12 179:7 191:17 213:13 Noncommercial 5:1 none 42:4 nonreturnable 190:21 nonsensical 143:2 non-interactive 11:8 18:9 26:13 27:1 28:16 229:11,16 260:17 non-subscription 37:19 171:4 normal 205:16 268:4 288:5 notebook 9:6 noted 136:3 notes 44:14 234:7.8 nothing 47:10 76:2 166:20 167:2 169:14 208:6,13 261:21 notice 1:19 268:11 291:14,21 292:5 notices 291:20 noticing 268:17,19 November 1:17 293:15 nowhere 148:10 **NPD** 6:11,13,14,19,21 6:22 12:8,9,10,11,16 in in . 12:21 13:8,11 14:6 14:16 15:7.15 16:7 17:4 22:5 28:17

29:14,16 31:9,14,15 64:15 219:11,19,19 220:12 222:10,20 226:12,15 227:1,3,6 227:17,21 228:2 230:6 237:15 239:5 240:2,10 245:5 265:18 266:17 269:5 270:8 277:17 NPR 2:15.15 274:19 number 10:1 12:2 16:1 34:2,6,8,10,15 35:6 35:14,17 36:3,4 37:12 40:9 49:12 72:13 75:7,22 89:18 100:1 103:3 116:21 117:10 173:9,13,14 175:18 179:16 181:3 181:6,12,13,15,16,17 182:9,10,13 183:10 184:6 198:22 218:11 218:12,22 219:5 220:4 221:22 222:1 223:22 231:4,10 232:18 233:20 235:18 236:14 244:16 245:19 248:21 251:6,12 252:21 259:1 267:9 267:19 278:20 283:6 numbers 20:7 23:9 72:20 115:20 116:18 119:13 130:7 178:14 179:17 180:12 181:20 193:18 221:6 221:21 223:10,17 249:7 255:12,21 263:7 277:22 278:6 279:16 numerical 26:1 NW 2:18 3:19 N.W 2:6,12 3:4 4:8,22 5:8

O O 2:4 object 46:13 81:8 88:17 95:15 **objection** 8:20 9:3 21:14 28:1 29:4,4,17 29:22 47:18 48:3,11 55:7,11,15 57:5 90:19 96:6 100:14,15 101:15 102:1 103:8 260:3.5 objects 93:10 observable 26:11,14 observation 72:7 73:6 observed 70:4 239:17 obtain 13:7 32:22 obtaining 102:16

obtains 45:19 obviously 30:19 47:3 179:7 265:19 287:11 occasions 75:7 occurred 139:15 154:15 occurring 125:22 October 34:3,8 35:18 68:8 71:21 217:14,22 off 62:22 72:18 99:13 146:16 168:6 184:18 220:16 253:6 254:3.6 265:6 293:12 offer 8:19 46:5 55:3 70:22 76:1 84:4 134:21 202:10 259:20 offered 60:8 123:16 201:6 283:6 offerers 135:17 offering 59:18,20 70:8 70:17 73:21 79:10 166:12 169:6 172:14 172:15 174:8,10,12 202:8,11 289:20 offerings 79:1 Office 94:18 offset 24:6 offsetting 39:10,13 often 117:17 147:16 285:8 Oh 72:12 212:10 okay 20:5,10 22:17 25:6 33:7 56:21 66:17 67:14 73:1 74:11 82:7 87:15 88:1 91:10 101:22 104:4,7 114:14 115:8 118:20 128:21 129:3 134:11 147:5 175:15 177:2 180:8 181:5 182:14,18 183:3 184:13,17 195:1 204:3 215:4 221:10 224:1 234:5 236:12 248:4 251:9,17 258:19 266:13 290:22 older 218:8 246:6 once 45:13 one 12:19 16:12,17 18:15 19:9,10,11,18 19:19,20 20:1,6 21:11 23:1,14 24:4 25:11 27:21 35:16 40:18 41:1 43:4,20 52:17 54:6 60:11 61:16 63:10,11,13

70:14 72:20 73:3,14

73:15 78:9 79:9 80:7

81:1,2,3,17,20 82:7,7

84:11 87:9 92:15,16 93:2,3 95:16 98:3,4 99:16 104:2 105:7,9 107:4 109:19 110:12 112:15 113:4 114:17 115:8 123:21 124:12 125:6 127:6 131:3 133:8 134:19,21 136:3 138:3 145:20 145:22 149:11 155:5 155:16,20 156:8,21 158:8 162:20 166:11 166:21 168:7 169:11 171:4 173:6 181:2.8 181:14,14,16 186:5 186:16 193:14 194:3 194:4,4 203:13 204:9 206:4 207:19 210:14 210:16 215:8 238:12 250:13 259:11,12 269:16 271:1 272:3 277:19 280:4,5,7 281:8,11,21 282:15 283:4 285:4 286:20 288:4 289:1,1,5,8 291:13,22 ones 73:10 113:17,18 114:19 164:11 194:10,10 282:7 one-tenth 36:17 one-to-one 130:12,16 131:6,11 134:3 online 176:7 only 12:22 19:5 27:7 40:18 62:15 63:10 66:1,7 72:21 97:15 107:11 114:6 132:22 140:1 152:4 166:14 172:14 173:5,6 174:4 174:6 201:14 202:11 209:14 213:15.17 214:12,16 215:20 218:8,17 230:18 237:11 246:18 251:18 256:9.14 274:9 280:11 290:16 onto 139:20 146:13 191:17 onward 193:18 on-demand 17:22 25:12,21 65:2,6,12 66:10 67:10 141:12 141:16 142:10 194:14 221:16 279:1 open 9:6 opening 9:14,16 operating 79:20 opinion 23:8 30:21 40:3 48:17 59:22 61:10,15 126:12

134:7 215:9 240:19

opportunistic 52:21 53:17 opportunity 31:7 61:17 144:16 145:15 175:4 273:11 286:5 opposed 49:9 85:11 205:1 206:3 229:11 option 50:9 204:13 205:1.1 optional 188:13 options 50:7 oral 39:18 218:2 order 7:12 63:7 69:6 70:16 78:3 89:20 106:7 146:21 188:11 202:14 264:2,4,6,9 organizations 98:6 original 26:20 28:13 50:17 117:18 other 11:6 15:19,21 16:13 18:12,15 19:19 24:1 27:18 28:8 30:12 33:21 38:7,22 39:9 41:2,5 46:2,18 49:21 50:9,16 56:8 64:17 66:17 73:15 77:4 78:11 79:16 81:2 84:12 87:6,7 92:7,8,17 98:3 102:12 105:8,10 106:11 107:4 112:8 113:17 114:15,18,18 115:17 124:1,13 126:9 128:7 129:7,16 131:5,6,11,20 133:5 134:3,22 137:17 141:5,15 146:1 149:11 154:20 155:5 155:16 156:8 169:12 178:2,7 179:11 181:14 185:17,19,21 187:14 190:11.17 201:5 202:20 203:2.9 204:10 207:20 208:9 210:15,16,19 211:5 211:18 213:8 221:18 224:10 230:10,12 238:5 245:14 248:7 253:2 256:16 257:3 258:13 264:13 265:7 269:11 272:4 273:15 276:2 280:1 281:22 286:20 289:1,5 others 64:7 otherwise 201:7 207:14 ought 283:7,8,11 out 12:16 14:20 15:17 36:4 42:20 57:4 63:7 67:18 89:4,8,12 97:16 98:14 101:12

199:17 117:9 118:21 120:10 187:15,19 204:1,12 116:2,17,20,22 117:8 115:10,20 119:11,12 129:12 134:1 138:21 221:14 265:20 275:8 percentage 58:9,22 119:13,21 120:3 118:9,16 138:18 97:5 149:10,15 150:8 153:16,19,21 154:8 122:2,3 136:9,10 163:10 166:11 payable 190:18 139:21 140:11,21,21 150:13 170:11 169:16 188:22 paying 99:3 102:17 158:17 172:14,21 143:6 147:7,18,19 172:11 175:7 187:20 187:20 199:8 201:20 192:15 197:2 198:4 175:18 224:13 254:7 202:6,7,15 203:6,11 198:20 200:16 203:7 204:13 228:21 256:5 288:11 152:15 153:22 outcome 85:9 88:5 156:12,16 163:9,13 206;3,4 228:15 257:1 payment 41:11 45:14 204:14 218:20 274:7 53:10 118:13 202:5 percentages 274:6 156:8 159:19 166:6 167:16 175:14 286:7 outlier 264:18 265:19 180:4 185:9 187:3,11 partially 21:3 277:14 **perform** 16:19 24:9 participant 253:19,20 189:17,20 191:17,20 payments 109:4 290:9 31:8,15 35:19 219:4 266.2 192:3,7,8,21 194:21 pays 132:22 225:22 240:7,15,17 outliers 266:17,18 254:1 269:18 Pelcovits 6:3,6,17 7:10 241:2,17,20 242:6 over 14:14 22:11 23:15 196:22 200:22 participants 124:15 108:10 142:2 145:22 208:22 211:12.13 158:2 209:8 210:9 7:16.18 8:4.6.17.21 263:3 273:22 9:5.12 27:21 30:10 performance 1:6 82:9 147:17 150:17 212:4,20 213:11,19 participate 190:2 292:13 32:12 39:17 42:11 97:8,19 98:6,7,21 155:13 161:18 179:2 214:3,3,4 215:17 participating 22:10 45:19 46:22 47:22 100:9,21 101:6 180:12,22 183:5,20 216:8 218:5 226:10 particular 13:12 16:5 48:14 51:13 54:15 102:14,17,22 103:4 184:2 203:21 252:10 228:18 242:12 246:8 254:1 273:9 278:6 246:10 248:13,14,15 31:2 44:6 49:5,7 50:4 55:18 64:21 90:2 103:22 105:3,14 249:1,2,3 254:21 50:5,8,18 51:10 52:9 102:5 109:7 122:6 106:3 109:1 111:5,8 285:12 overall 30:21 31:20 255:13 264:7 267:1,6 56:18 59:3 69:3 134:18 147:2 185:5 111:13 121:11,18 32:6 40:12 112:20 271:6 274:3 276:8 75:13 77:4 91:15 189:21 208:20 221:4 122:12,19 123:6,22 114:8,9 115:1 117:4 285:19 286:3 113:13 114:10 226:11 232:2 236:21 125:6 126:4 127:8 128:22 129:1 195:6 124:13 pages 72:4,11,12 73:4 115:18 120:12 239:2 241:1 245:2 254:15 266:15 270:3 performances 93:6 overestimate 223:6 76:10,13 224:1,3 124:21 125:15 272:18 274:3 275:4 97:17 108:13,17 overlooking 269:10 253:2 255:2 270:6 127:21 137:8 138:18 performed 10:18 overruled 57:7 88:20 paid 18:5,7 40:1 42:6,9 138:19 139:11 145:7 281:11 283:4 285:18 90:22 101:16 103:12 42:15 43:6 44:19 146:5,10 161:19 pending 165:14 210:18 133:22 240:2 performing 68:22 272:16 69:6 97:10 99:2 164:1 167:13 175:22 penetration 226:1 137:3 oversight 88:11 178:12 187:3 215:7 people 15:7 20:1 22:10 106:16 107:16 108:20 139:12 172:6 217:17 285:10 22:13,22 24:10 37:16 perhaps 58:16 283:3 overstate 278:17 period 84:21 150:18 overstatement 39:11 183:19 190:17 289:21 292:18 38:19 76:11 95:17 overstates 107:9 197:12 199:19 200:9 particularly 42:21 127:22 170:14 174:9 155:13 161:20 over-the-air 233:12 277:8 278:10,12 180:13,18 183:5 201:12 222:13 174:11,14 175:6 210:11 211:9 249:21 own 31:12 106:17 229:14,21 230:7 176:11,21 177:9 284:5 151:15 162:17 202:3 231:6 232:19 233:14 198:4 200:13 220:10 250:2,9 259:12 parties 47:2 82:14 212:13 286:6 288:3 102:19,21 149:8,18 283:10 234:16,17 244:5 223:5 225:16,18 owned 271:7 279:7,11,11,21,21 150:5 154:9 158:20 233:4,8,18 235:19 periods 22:11 221:19 permanent 142:8 owner 51:8 80:17 159:4 160:9 162:10 237:18 246:20 248:5 290:18 162:12 203:22 284:8 Perrelli 2:5 190:5 panel 154:12 167:20 258:4 279:6,11,17 115:11 139:3 owners 53:4 54:18 85:8 panelists 14:6,22 292:9 280:11,12 289:22 persistence 92:10 114:17,18 130:15 paper 169:17 214:8 partner 292:20 290:5 112:22 113:8 persistent 113:14 136:11 180:22 183:8 223:14 225:6,7 232:3 partners 291:22 people's 111:20 parts 126:12 167:14 papers 228:2,4 230:15 per 11:5,5,8 21:8 34:16 person 176:3 190:18 183:14,17 204:21 207:6 275:7 276:3,13 paradigm 52:1 190:8 233:10 34:16,17,17 36:6,6 223:13 262:9 264:11 277:1.5 Paradise 4:20 party 155:4,20 201:4 36:16,16,17 38:8,8 268:12,20 270:11 ownership 273:17 paragraph 100:5,7 206:12 207:2,3,8,21 60:15,19,20,21 61:3 271:7,14 273:5 **OXENFORD** 4:21 101:3,20 102:10 passage 103:19 61:5,6,20 62:11,14 278:13 past 234:20 249:9 143:10,10 147:19 87:19 90:2 104:19 personnel 15:7 152:14 156:15 180:3 252:20 144:18,18 145:9,11 persons 262:16 pattern 130:2 P 8:4 187:5 195:3 211:22 167:22 168:2 171:20 perspective 288:9 package 54:20 58:13 213:11 214:4 216:10 PAUL 2:5 175:20 179:22 180:1 persuasive 92:18 pertained 69:4 197:13 198:20 216:11 218:6 228:17 pause 103:2 274:15 182:11 203:14 pertaining 186:13 packaged 195:15 242:14 274:4 285:19 282:17 204:12 205:15,16,21 parenthetical 195:7 pay 51:11 116:2 117:11 207:9 phase 39:19 100:4 page 17:2 42:11,13 perceive 86:11 140:22 292:15 67:18 70:6,21 71:7 196:4 131:18 133:17,19 72:3,9,10,13,20 73:4 parentheticals 195:11 144:17 145:9 166:11 percent 37:11 44:21 phone 43:20,22 166:17,21 167:3,11 73:22 76:11,12,14 Parkway 4:4 45:11,17 61:6 86:5 phones 45:2 part 56:14 59:12 60:7 77:9 78:7 80:6 81:19 167:13,22 168:2,13 90:4 91:16 108:21 phony 201:19 60:14,21,22 61:7,13 81:21 87:16 92:22 168:13 171:2,5,20,21 109:22 111:7 167:21 phrase 67:4 102:4 132:19 192:17 196:9 99:22 101:2 102:6 61:20 62:12 65:6,7 172:2,13 173:2,4,5 168:1,9 171:19,20 104:15 114:19 91:9 101:18 104:10 173:11 174:5,6,14,20 172:5 173:16 199:12 196:15,16

physical 141:1,11 picked 191:22 192:11 picking 129:22 picture 25:22 pie 286:22 piece 41:1 52:9 59:8 75:13 79:5 84:7 104:17 111:13 145:22 pieces 29:15 124:21 125:18 128:16 place 87:2 124:10 267:16 276:18 places 78:11 182:17 planning 293:5 play 43:20 45:4 49:8 60:15,19,20,21 61:4 61:5,6,20 62:11,14 132:22 149:15 188:9 203:14 288:7 played 44:2,4 player 195:9,10,12,13 195:16 196:4 271:8 273:18 **players** 163:15 playing 32:19 44:13,14 plays 196:7 pleadings 63:12 please 17:1 42:12 103:14 209:1 211:11 213:10 218:6 242:11 plenty 53:15 PLLC 3:19 plus 198:15 199:9,14 256:7 plus-ed 141:14 point 45:3,6 47:6 73:19 75:18 76:1 123:10 130:18 139:21 146:6 148:11 154:8 156:12 169:1 176:7 192:20 238:7 288:10 polyphonic 44:5 pool 14:5 265:3 poor 209:7 poorer 157:18 popularity 51:12 population 15:3 218:14 219:1,6,8,14 222:22 223:3,13 227:4,10,14 233:8 236:12 237:4,6 245:18 255:16 267:15 portability 66:19,20 portable 271:7 273:17 portal 66:15 portion 45:4 100:7 201:14 286:6 287:3,5 288:18 posed 137:18 posit 169:16

positing 140:14 position 105:3 160:12 160:20 161:12,17 possibility 10:9 87:10 271:18 272:11 possible 17:17 38:19 61:1 139:9 193:9 267:22 269:8 possibly 149:14 249:18 potential 14:5 186:20 potentially 18:8 39:11 98:12 164:21 power 53:6 80:17,19 81:5 82:1 115:12,15 powerful 18:12 75:12 260:19 261:2,17 262:4 powers 66:11 practice 53:8 precedent 182:3,6 preceding 271:20 precise 62:10 162:15 206:10 precisely 32:2 54:10 57:1 132:2 136:15 208:5 225:17 preclude 240:19 predicate 91:6 predominantly 130:16 preferable 205:10 preferred 95:12 96:15 155:20 203:21 prefiled 9:10 premature 47:19 preparation 63:14 prepared 221:11 preparing 56:19 263:2 presence 173:4 present 113:10,11 230:12 291:10 presented 11:12 12:8 27:13,19 28:2 29:19 30:13,16 101:1 232:8 264:2 presenting 43:15 230:9 presents 40:18 press 12:21 55:6 187:15 pressures 139:16 presumably 192:22 presume 155:14 presumed 154:17 presumes 103:9 presumption 155:1 pretty 208:3 246:22 prevailed 91:21 prevailing 179:19 prevails 91:20 prevent 53:17 277:13 previous 169:21 247:11

272:1

previously 8:14,17 133:22 238:22 260:8 price 44:22 45:8,12 51:1 59:18,19 80:20 87:1.3 107:8.16 139:1 140:16 154:5 166:12 168:8 169:11 171:7 172:1 173:5,6 173:13,15,22 174:1 174:20,21 179:19 180:13 183:18 197:9 197:11 199:19 200:9 200:11 202:4 204:1 208:4,10 277:6 281:14 283:22 288:14 prices 106:16 108:20 124:14 126:16 139:7 167:5 174:16 285:9 pricing 95:3,13 96:5,17 119:3 120:8,13 121:14 135:22 primary 141:2 principally 124:18 198:8 printout 236:5 prior 84:10 133:2 185:10 210:11 247:14,19 248:1,6 249:14 270:13 284:10 privilege 180:17 probably 200:2 220:5 223:12 287:20 problem 47:10 67:12 72:19 101:11 156:3 182:20 203:20 208:5 277:11 problematic 238:8 procedures 293:1 proceed 254:5 proceeding 1:9 9:18 33:3 88:6 89:22 122:6 156:22 209:22 210:6 241:11 260:18 283:5 289:19 proceedings 292:12 produced 99:11 100:3 220:19 221:5 237:1 248:20 255:3 producer 50:1,3,6 51:7 51:8 128:11 129:10 131:12,15 133:12 138:19 139:11 145:4 producers 144:7 product 40:21 71:1 128:7 129:6,15 134:10,11,11,13,13 135:17 170:2 200:11 276:15 289:10,12 production 125:11

144:9 products 73:21 134:21 135:7,16 141:1 166:18 167:11 201:5 professional 15:13 profit 140:14 143:4 profits 140:18,18,19 141:7 142:22 157:13 286:17 programmed 43:22 project 162:17 projected 150:8,11 projecting 150:17 projection 152:9 projections 148:13 149:2,5,18 150:2,20 151:14,15,21 promote 35:1 73:11 77:19 215:7 promotion 11:13,22 12:3.4 promotional 35:3 38:14,15 39:7,12 46:10,15 47:14 48:2 177:8 214:7 215:1 pronounced 39:7 properly 125:13 property 119:10 120:20 128:17 185:19 proposal 17:19 59:11 60:11,19 63:9 201:21 203:10 205:4 proposals 63:6 propose 9:20 103:7 proposed 9:17,19 10:6 40:4 55:21 61:14 64:1 171:18 189:19 196:18 proposes 39:22 proposition 80:14 133:21 147:10 166:9 168:8 170:7 177:7 proprietary 227:22 protect 202:16 protection 198:14 protects 200:5 201:16 201:17 provide 66:18 75:21 78:22 106:7 187:6 227:21 228:7 230:16 239:16 262:4 provided 9:14 12:7 44:22 49:3 112:15 114:11 123:16 190:8 230:15 239:6 243:17 269:7 provider 79:8,20 101:8 118:15 providers 53:8 55:5

75:21 76:7 84:3

149:4 provides 35:14 191:10 provision 201:15 202:21 provisions 175:17 203:22 proxy 34:10 225:13 public 2:15,16 4:2 93:6 97:8,17,19 98:5,7,18 98:20 100:21 101:6 102:13 103:4,21 105:3,13 108:13 111:4,13 125:6 150:20 151:6,9,18 152:3 publicly 151:13 241:7 published 139:3 publisher 46:1,5 81:17 116:16 117:11 144:1 281:13 **publishers** 55:2 81:20 82:8 90:6 94:11 95:2 96:13 105:2 110:7,14 114:6 115:3 116:22 144:6 275:18 281:18 publishing 115:22 117:12 284:12 pull 146:4 purchase 49:7 125:2 128:13 143:13 183:10 216:21 217:9 219:22 purchased 16:1 20:18 20:19 21:6 34:6,15 36:6 137:10 188:3 219:5 222:1,3,7,22 224:21 226:16,17 264:13,15 268:8 271:2,9,14 273:17 277:2 purchaser 200:9 purchasers 199:13,17 267:10 purchases 11:5 12:15 13:4,15,17 15:19 16:16 20:13 21:10 22:2 23:6,16,22 24:5 24:7 26:4,10,17 32:17 33:9,11 36:2 36:22 37:3,15 126:9 178:1,6 179:9 184:5 218:21 219:14 221:17,18 223:9,19 224:5,14 226:3 242:17 249:16 263:8 263:21,22 267:3 272:6 278:1 purchasing 37:19 188:4 267:6 purely 202:14 purport 270:6

purporting 28:1 purpose 226:20 purposes 103:1 128:20 128:21 131:13 145:21 164:12 185:18 275:22 pursuant 1:19 push 209:6 put 37:12 68:4 86:5 100:11 110:20 117:9 143:21 145:7 158:12 189:8 193:2,6 203:14 226:21 241:12 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N... p.m 146:16,17,19 184:20,22 253:7,9

293:13

quadrant 72:4,11,14 76:13 77:10 120:4 122:5 Qualified 2:16 qualify 201:7 quantified 13:1 quantifies 169:5 quantify 13:3 59:8 169:14,18 quantifying 170:18 quantitative 30:15 241:18 242:7 quarterly 151:7 question 16:2 18:3,13 22:4 48:7 55:14 73:5 74:5 86:8 88:19 91:1 91:5,7,9 92:15 96:8 97:16 103:1,14,18 114:14 120:3,5,22 122:5,10 126:18 132:9,10,16 135:2,13 138:9 140:1 143:17 144:3 149:6 152:17 153:3 162:3,20 164:7 165:13 166:9 168:16 193:5 200:18 233:6 235:10,22 243:11,19 245:7,10,13 246:7,10 247:8 252:13 253:13 258:7 266:9 272:10 272:15 273:4,5,7,9 273:11 283:15 questioned 275:5 questioning 103:9 questionnaire 6:19 25:7,13 227:15 244:8 244:13 245:5 257:19 259:17 260:2 272:20 questions 13:11,13 15:22 19:1,11 22:13

46:19 99:12 121:1

122:21 139:18 158:1 175:11 181:19 184:8 185:6 187:10 197:5 228:15 245:14 261:15,17 263:21 264:10 270:13,17 274:1,17,19 275:6 276:7 277:20 279:4 282:12,18 283:1 285:16 291:2 quickly 9:13 270:3 quite 12:18 43:2,3 148:7 151:3 177:20 237:22 280:16

R R 2:10 4:14 radio 2:15,16 3:17 4:2 4:20 5:3,16 44:8 62:7 65:19 67:9 83:11,18 84:3 85:17 87:9 89:2 89:4 146:3 147:20 148:3,11 175:7 206:21 214:7,21 215:2,6,12 261:22 262:6,8,12,16,21 263:4 273:19 Radioio.com 4:19 **RAHN** 5:12 raise 168:14 raised 47:7 154:5 randomized 264:8,9 range 12:13 45:11,16 199:12 239:16 248:10 ranges 159:6 240:9 rate 1:9 17:19 38:17 40:1 60:14,15,19,20 60:21 61:4,5,6,13,14 61:15,20 62:11,12,13 62:14,16 82:19 83:1 83:5,7,20 85:12,19 86:3,10,15,17,18,21 87:4.8.10,13,20 88:2 88:6,10,11,13 89:21 90:3,15,17 91:16 93:2.11.17.19 108:15 111:14,14,18,19,19 111:21 138:15 161:9 161:15,16,18 164:13 164:14 201:21 203:7 203:14 204:13,14,17 204:18 205:4,15 206:2,7,11 207:9 281:21 rates 9:18 11:1 84:17 84:19 85:15 87:17 90:13,14 91:12,15

96:17 111:21 112:1

130:14 134:2 147:6

161:2 209:7,21 210:5

210:21 211:2 281:20 283:5 290:9 rather 57:13 60:13 67:5 74:21 123:4 143:22 158:12 227:14 ratio 117:3,13 118:11 118:16 rational 286:4 287:1 290:2 raw 31:13 227:7 228:5 239:10 240:6 248:16 268:2 re 6:17 reach 79:8 111:16 157:8 reached 89:6 214:13 reaching 214:6 reacted 159:4 read 30:3 47:11 56:19 95:16 100:5,6 103:14 170:4,9 175:18 195:2 reading 28:11 37:21 real 52:14,16 181:20 197:21 reality 68:7 really 12:22 23:19 28:12 51:9 65:2 86:19 116:18 121:8 153:15 155:19 265:8 280:16 281:17 283:22 288:1 reason 32:7 49:20 96:3 156:4 163:3 209:14 209:14 260:19 261:2 265:7 278:12 279:15 reasonable 34:10 59:21 61:8,11 82:4 93:12 93:18 96:19 112:1 170:18,21,22 203:4 238:13 278:18 reasonablely 292:9 reasonably 195:15 reasons 40:9 REB 99:22 100:1 rebranding 208:11 rebuttal 6:5 9:10 11:17 67:18 71:13,16 78:7 99:17 100:4 123:2 185:7 188:21,22 189:11 193:15,21 197:1 209:1 211:12 212:16 220:22 221:7 231:19 232:1,3 236:17,22 238:17 239:1 242:1,12 244:16,19 245:2 248:13 254:11 255:1 257:20 259:16,20

260:10 266:21

269:21 270:5 272:19

292:15 REB003113-14 6:21 REB003117-18 6:19 recall 25:2 33:18 51:15 65:15,17 66:5 71:20 81:9 93:21,21 98:1 98:13 104:8,11 116:13 117:20 130:7 142:1 144:13 148:1 151:17,20 176:5,14 179:16 186:1 190:9 199:10 207:11 210:13 211:10 217:15,19,21 218:4 219:15 220:15 231:10 234:1 236:14 244:10,11 251:5 252:19,21 254:15 268:18 269:1 271:13 275:8 276:10 278:2 279:8 **Recd** 6:5 receive 15:14 41:10 45:11 52:11.11 63:21 113:1 224:4 228:10 274:6 received 15:16 99:18 191:21 195:5 226:12 260:12 292:2 receives 33:12 196:5 receiving 113:5 290:5 recently 94:16 recess 62:20 146:16 253:5 293:11 recessed 63:2 146:18 184:21 253:8 293:14 recognition 152:5 recognize 116:15 127:22 239:2 245:3 255:5 272:7 recognized 51:6 163:13 recognizing 276:21 recollect 235:16 recollection 97:21 216:15 217:2 220:18 237:3 248:12 253:3 270:4 recommendation 38:18 recommended 11:1 61:6 230:8 reconvene 146:18 293:14 reconvened 63:2 184:21 253:8 record 7:4 8:2 46:3 48:8 53:11 55:1 62:22 63:5 72:18 76:8 83:17 98:18 100:12 101:18 114:5

115:2 124:3 139:4

140:3,22 141:17

142:4 144:2,5,11,11 146:16.21 156:19 162:21 163:4,12 164:17,19 169:1 184:19 185:2 194:19 196:10 201:18 212:22 213:15 216:5 220:16 225:9 244:15 253:6,11 254:3,6,22 258:22 274:5 275:17 281:18 284:18 287:8 293:12 recorded 13:17 15:19 16:16 24:1 37:2 68:12 221:19 242:17 recording 40:19 42:2,8 42:15 44:11,13 45:5 45:7.9 46:6 48:1 49:6 49:8,9 50:4,5,17,18 50:21 51:5,10 52:6 53:22 55:1 67:22 80:17 85:8 88:13 90:12 92:3,10 105:22 106:10,17 107:10,14 107:22 112:20 114:17 115:10 116:1 116:17,21 117:5,8,10 118:12,14 121:19 123:12 124:5 127:18 127:21 128:1,3,15,20 129:12 130:15 131:4 131:13,19,21 133:2,6 133:9,14,18,19 134:1 136:6,11 137:2,2,15 138:4,11,12,14,19 139:11 145:13,14 164:4 180:22 183:7 183:14,17 201:17 204:21 207:6 215:22 275:7 276:3,9,13 277:2,10,15 recordings 1:6,7 48:16 50:8 53:9 54:18 56:7 70:15,20 83:14 112:17 113:1 121:4 121:10,12,17 122:8,9 122:11,12 123:6,21 124:1,21 125:12 126:3,5,8 127:6,8 143:14,17 150:16 185:16 284:19 recover 58:20 287:3,4 288:14,18 289:11 recovered 287:1 recovering 286:14 recovery 141:7 289:14 289:14 Recross 6:2 281:7,9 Redirect 6:2 275:2 reduce 23:16 reduction 26:9

Redwood 4:4.4 refer 56:22 64:17 65:1 97:13 110:3 133:3 136:10 147:18 188:20 211:21 214:5 249:17 257:19 282:7 reference 168:21 178:12 194:5 213:3 213:20 258:3 265:14 283:15 referred 71:15 104:16 175:19 193:20 220:21 231:18 236:16 238:16 244:18 254:10 260:6 269:20 referring 101:19 113:16.19 130:9 132:16,20 167:20 210:21 213:7,16,18 215:5 243:6 refers 197:2 274:8 reflect 37:6 258:22 278:7 reflected 222:10 reflecting 178:6 reflection 267:11 reflections 159:14 reflects 17:6 199:6,7 270:17 refresh 9:13 65:5 220:18 248:12 253:3 refreshes 237:3 270:4 regard 52:20 241:7 regarding 11:13 regardless 82:16 113:12 114:3 142:18 regression 265:9 regular 15:13 regularly 274:5 regulatory 91:19 Rein 5:8 rejecting 83:11 relate 218:22 related 58:11 111:9 216:9 relates 100:7 143:17 217:13 relating 40:10 140:12 185:22 255:3 263:21 272:3 relationship 92:2,6 114:4 130:13 131:10 173:8 174:3 219:16 relative 48:15 80:18 90:11 113:11 114:8 115:2 148:3 223:9 278:6 relatively 43:10 136:22 137:1 140:12 181:13 202:4 219:12

released 272:22 relevant 12:17 114:22 115:7 120:7,9 133:14 192:7 276:15 reliant 50:3 relied 110:2 164:12 169:20 224:8 268:6 relies 41:1 49:10 60:14 143:11 Religious 5:1,4 reluctant 241:4 rely 23:17 89:12 208:7 219:20 relying 30:12 65:10 66:2 110:21 remain 205:9 remained 45:16 remaining 18:11 250:5 remains 148:5 remember 18:15 64:1 65:9.14 93:20 168:3 170:5 190:7 197:6 210:1 220:10 260:21 268:17,19 remind 32:14 99:14 167:20 remove 57:19 226:5 removed 265:8 render 159:13,16 214:21 rendered 186:22 210:12 rendition 118:10 repeat 245:9 repertoire 70:7,19 74:1 79:12 146:11 repertoires 71:8 rephrase 120:7 report 12:21 47:10,17 67:18,18 240:3,10 268:3 269:12 278:1 279:5 reported 151:13 223:17 263:8 267:3,6 REPORTER 189:2 reporting 223:18 reports 33:9 151:4 152:3 221:17 represent 17:15 19:10 20:9 21:17 23:9 24:15 100:2 102:8 174:18,19 237:1 248:22 representative 15:2 48:9 227:9,13 267:15 represents 21:9,18 24:16 42:13,14 102:15 179:13 218:20

reproduce 162:9

reproduction 97:7,16

109:9,19 111:10 reproductions 94:7 96:14 request 227:20 require 70:6 161:1 required 188:3.9 requirement 102:20 research 8:11 12:19 resolution 98:10 resolved 97:11 resort 83:5 respect 8:18 10:1 12:4 12:7 23:5 24:10 26:15 28:16 30:10 59:5,6,11,14 69:15 69:19 74:6.8.9.15.20 76:5 78:6,11,17 85:2 91:11.14 95:4 98:11 99:8 102:1,18 104:9 106:12 108:11 116:5 116:8,10,11 117:15 120:11 121:13,14 123:15 128:7,10 129:7,20 136:4 138:10,21 140:2 150:21 155:9,10,11 161:5 169:19 177:9 207:19 209:4 244:1 247:3,4 252:2 255:9 256:21 259:10 272:21 283:11 287:13 respond 16:2 63:20 243:12 272:15 273:5 286:11 respondent 14:12 19:4 228:2 245:11 255:10 261:5 263:9 265:15 267:13,14 272:20 respondents 14:5,7,10 14:16 15:1,20 16:15 17:21 18:6,7 20:13 227:9,15 245:20 246:16 261:10 responding 149:6 261:5 response 9:1 16:4 64:12 197:5 246:7 263:4 277:19 285:9 responses 14:9,14 15:21 63:11,17 122:21 220:6 227:8 228:3,5 241:19,21 270:7 274:1 responsibility 100:8 116:1 responsible 102:16 117:17 rest 293:6 restate 173:1 restricted 99:10,13

restrictive 100:12 result 29:8 34:12,14 158:6 173:7 230:11 resulted 155:12 156:7 results 17:3,7,8 26:7 27:8 30:15,17 31:13 32:1,2 35:21 49:16 228:6,8 230:16 240:3 245:18 269:12 273:15 279:4 280:1,3 retail 44:22 45:12 retailing 287:19 returns 124:14 **REV** 270:6 revealed 241:7 revenue 55:20.22 56:4 56:10.13.15 57:2 58:3,5,9,10,17,19,20 59:1 61:1,12,17 119:6 141:3 148:14 149:11,15 150:8,14 180:21 183:7 184:9 185:8,11,15,18 186:11,12 187:19 188:8,14,19 189:19 191:20 192:9 194:6 195:14 196:8,21 200:16 201:8,13,20 202:6,7,15,18 203:6 203:12 204:5,14 208:7 274:6 289:14 revenues 56:6 57:11 112:18,21 113:11 114:5,8 115:1 120:14 140:13 141:16 142:2 150:17 172:22 186:6 187:13 189:18,22 190:16,16 191:9 192:15 193:3 195:3,4 195:18 207:21 285:22 286:5 290:19 review 27:18 63:6 99:18,19 197:18 217:16 218:1 226:22 228:1 reviewed 28:3,5 39:17 47:3 55:20 194:12 reviewing 11:19 27:8 126:22 Rhapsody 18:14 66:3 RIAA 84:10 89:6 141:21 148:13 149:5 149:10 150:6 152:12 154:6,16 155:12 156:7,13,19,22 157:8 159:20,21 204:9 218:12 219:1 **RICH 3:3** right 1:6 18:2 19:8,8 20:8 25:6 29:9 30:16 42:8,9 44:16,19

45:15 46:4.20 49:8 65:13,20 66:11 69:3 74:18 76:13 79:14 81:11 86:6 88:7.16 90:18 93:4.11.14 94:1 97:7,8,16 101:6 104:14 105:13.14 106:3,9,11,15 107:2 107:5,6 109:14 111:5 111:9 117:1.18 119:19,21 122:2,12 127:18 128:13 132:4 132:4 133:1,2,19,19 134:4,15 138:15,16 139:5 144:18,19 145:10,10 146:6,15 153:7.19 157:3.13 158:11,22 159:9 160:2,13 168:10 170:16 171:7,11,16 171:21 172:3,7,15 175:21 177:1,16 178:3 181:1,21 182:10,19 183:18,21 184:2 186:7 187:1,8 192:6,20 196:18 199:3 200:14 223:15 224:18 231:11,12,15 236:1 247:11 248:10 250:21 252:14 257:14 258:8.17 259:4 275:22 276:4 277:3 278:16 281:15 283:15 284:12,12 285:6 286:7 288:3 291:6 rights 41:10 42:2,2,6 44:11 45:20 49:17 52:3,17,18 55:2,3 68:20,21,22 80:5 82:10 95:4 98:21 100:9,22 103:4,22 104:11 105:21,22 106:6 109:1,4,6,19 111:10,10 112:14 113:12,21 114:11 117:12,17 118:6,12 122:19 125:19,20 131:3,4 133:16 136:5 136:6,21 138:5,12,13 139:9 166:7 276:1,13 right-hand 72:14 77:10 100:1 108:10 119:15

right-to-use 185:22

ring 6:8 41:19 43:7,9

45:21 46:7,9,15

43:17,18 44:3,10,22

47:14,22 48:17 49:6

54:22 55:4 68:10,22

69:11 74:20 75:1,2

75:12,20 76:5,6,16

116:12 124:4 141:1 89:19 100:16 117:21 120:12 146:10 77:2,8 78:11,13,17 script 72:2 141:10,11,12,14,15 SDAR 147:5,6,11,21 118:1,3 128:12 137:7 150:17 159:20 78:19 79:5,7,12,19 164:10 166:12 170:7 90:5 91:14 94:3,8,20 142:1,7,8,8 180:20 148:14,16,20 149:9 169:4 170:19 178:11 170:8,16 171:6,7 150:17,21 154:6,15 179:15 265:12,14,17 95:4,10 96:14 97:4 181:7 183:8 185:19 172:7,11 173:5,14,15 156:7,20 159:20,21 sees 28:21 195:14 225:9 97:18,20 98:8,19 same 22:10,13 24:9 174:21,21 176:4 SDARS 150:5 152:18 segment 286:17 99:3,4,8 100:22 155:11 156:13 segmentation 286:8 177:20 179:9 187:14 101:7 102:5,8 103:5 25:20 26:1 36:5 segmented 286:15 188:12 190:20 103:9 104:1,10 116:5 41:11,13 42:3 45:16 157:17 160:12 161:7 52:4,11 57:12,13 209:4,8 210:4,9,18 288:1 191:18 196:21 197:4 116:8,14 138:1,7 274:12 275:6 276:1 60:21 61:3 64:3 211:2.8 select 146:8 215:7 197:16,19,20 198:2 198:16 199:9,14,18 risk 241:13 66:17 69:14,18,22 second 75:14 181:2 selecting 113:4 self 222:6 223:18 199:20 200:5,12,14 River 129:11.11 113:6 120:15,17 192:14 195:4 213:11 Road 5:13 123:3 124:16 140:6 214:4 218:6 228:18 sell 53:21 54:1.19 66:19 200:20 201:1,2,3,5,7 245:10 248:16 249:3 170:3 275:22 276:14 201:9,10,13 202:2,11 Roback 175:3 146:19 148:11 287:9 202:14 203:1 205:15 Roback's 170:5 157:10 200:12 264:7 266:21 seller 58:6 168:7 288:9 205:16 206:2,13 ROBEDEE 3:7 205:15 206:5,13,21 seconds 176:17 secret 241:9 289:9 290:2 207:17,22 208:3,5,8 ROBERT 4:14 208:1.11 209:5.9 Roberts 1:22 119:18 219:7 246:12 257:11 section 83:21 88:7 94:6 sellers 10:2 126:15 208:9 221:13 222:12 271:2 272:6 277:14 157:7 160:21 189:18 135:5,10,15 142:17 222:15,18 228:22 241:1.14 285:17 278:13,20 279:22 189:20 150:16 229:3,9,16,19,20,22 286:21 287:12 288:8 289:18 290:22 293:5 secure 46:3,4 93:11 seller's 288:9,12 233:19 234:15 280:3,10 293:9 sample 15:2 69:19 secured 55:2 selling 36:9 168:9 235:13,20 236:3 role 149:15 288:7 266:1 securing 118:6 275:21 sells 187:17 242:16 243:3,13 Rolling 75:2 samples 41:21 78:2 security 198:15 send 14:20 245:8,12,15,21 246:12 247:9 249:2 room 1:13 182:3,6 111:3,4 241:19 see 12:20 16:14 17:3,12 sends 14:6 Rosenstein 291:15 satellite 147:20 149:4 20:12 21:22 23:1,6 sense 16:10 57:9 254:20 260:17 273:1 292:15 152:11 273:18 23:12,13,15 27:6 124:11 126:22 273:3 279:2 280:9,12 rotated 264:1 satisfied 35:9 30:22 43:3,14 48:15 128:15 168:10 188:2 280:13,14,18 281:2 290:5 round 180:7 satisfy 25:14 29:11 63:13 68:2 79:12 276:20 284:14 289:2 services 6:5 11:12 12:1 row 20:20 saw 170:9 84:6 92:1,9 99:8 sensitive 224:14 114:4 144:9 151:5 sensitivity 10:19 11:3 12:6,14 13:5,15 rovalties 82:4 saying 29:2,20 84:1 royalty 1:1 3:11 115:22 154:1 156:15 163:17 26:21 27:3 29:1 16:17 17:18 18:18,21 86:2 92:4,6 111:18 116:2,16,17 154:12 125:8.18 127:11 171:13 173:8.12 30:11 242:21 19:1 20:16 21:11 174:3,22 175:1 180:5 133:7,11 155:8 174:2 sent 239:4 23:19 24:18 25:12,14 161:2 sentence 66:8 101:21 25:17,20,21 26:8,12 rule 154:22 204:11 217:19 238:7 182:15,22 206:15 102:10 140:20 26:13 27:2,11 28:15 ruled 55:10 94:16,19 251:6 257:11 261:6 209:3 211:16 212:3 ruling 98:14 115:17 282:5,8 213:1 214:9 215:2,16 157:16 163:12 28:16,18,20 34:21 216:9 220:17 224:3,5 190:15 195:4,22 56:6 59:4,5,7,12,13 run 23:20,21 202:17 says 17:3 20:4,6 21:5 196:1,1 200:21 212:8 61:22 62:9 64:22 249:6 284:4 224:7,13 225:22 30:16 52:2 110:3,3 228:6 230:15 238:11 65:3,11,19 66:2,14 Ryan 5:6 292:2 213:12 214:5,19 190:16 192:5,15 66:18,21 67:11 70:20 195:4 200:22 209:6 241:21 242:3,18 218:16,21 228:18 **R-1** 189:13,15 212:6 221:12 234:7,8 244:8 248:15 252:9 243:1,4 274:8 71:13,16 74:16 76:16 R-25 6:6 253:1 262:22 266:22 R-26 6:8 99:6,17 270:12 278:19 separate 50:18 53:12 78:22 80:6,8 81:18 83:18 93:6 99:6,17 R-27 6:9 189:4 193:16 84:7 123:6 125:7 286:11 267:5,7 268:7 269:9 126:1,20 127:3 106:8 110:9 141:12 **SBC** 198:3 270:3,11,12,20 271:6 R-28 6:11 SBC-Yahoo 198:1,3,5 271:11 278:6 279:15 178:10 208:10 141:16 147:5,7,11,22 R-29 6:13 R-30 6:14 198:20 199:8 289:13 284:12 148:15,16 149:1,9 seeing 78:22 199:10 separately 18:21 60:8 150:22 152:11 154:6 R-31 6:16 SBR 5:11,12 278:21 235:16 279:10,15 154:15 156:7,20 R-32 6:19 scale 127:13 server 109:7,13 110:8 seek 133:22 140:15 159:22 166:18 R-33 6:21 scenario 277:1 R-34 6:22 scene 128:2,21 131:13 142:22 169:14 178:5 110:14 111:10 167:12 169:3,6,7,9 170:10 171:2,4 178:7 schedule 7:11 63:7 287:2,4 service 16:12,13 17:12 186:6 188:5 189:4 144:10 seeking 75:9 86:12 17:15,16,22 18:1,5 190:11,13 193:15,21 sale 49:11 121:9,17 scheduled 184:15 seeks 29:18 18:12,16 19:3,5,7,13 197:13 198:11,12,13 122:17 123:20 124:1 **SCHETTENHELM** seem 73:10,11,15 85:9 21:1,21 22:2 23:1,22 124:5 125:2,3,5,11 3:18 202:6 264:6 272:2 25:9 26:16 35:9 201:5,16,18 203:2 126:2,7 127:5 142:13 Schleimer 3:12 seemed 245:19 37:17 40:20 56:11 204:4,11,12 205:21 59:15,16 60:4,7,17 187:18 289:6 scientist 30:18 seems 73:12 219:12 206:12,20 211:15 213:4 218:18 219:7,9 Salem 5:2 62:10,14 66:11 67:9 scope 54:6 231:11 265:5 sales 10:11 34:22 39:9 screaming 65:3 seen 11:19 13:1 43:11 73:21 75:6 78:3 219:15,21 220:11,22 screening 257:16 56:16,18 70:12 75:20 79:10 84:3,4,6 106:6 221:7,16 223:11 46:10 77:19,21

224:10 225:1,4 showing 170:10 six 86:5 180:12,18,22 228:13,20 230:4 shown 114:19 264:3 183:5,21 222:22 231:8,19 232:1,3 shows 24:5 26:6,9,10 247:18,22 248:7 249:10,14,18 250:9 233:3,9,14 235:20 33:14 40:22 48:19 236:17.22 238:17 141:9 248:16 274:5 256:1,11,15 257:4,5 241:22 244:19 245:2 279:22 257:10 247:4.5 248:13 side 81:17 87:18 sixteen 86:5 size 14:11 165:20 166:4 105:22 108:9 109:21 250:19 252:5,11 114:17 155:5,16 skip 195:21 254:11 255:1 259:16 skipping 77:9 195:11 156:8 158:8 204:9 259:20 260:10 261:9 sides 148:22 149:7 266:21 269:21 270:5 196:4 skips 273:8 272:19 276:21 152:11 side's 154:17 **SLEDGE** 1:22 7:3,8,14 289:20 services/RIAA 148:20 signed 16:17 8:20 9:2 21:13,15 27:15 28:9 29:3,10 significance 239:21 **SESAC 102:19** 30:1 46:17,20 47:18 significant 22:1 26:11 session 99:13 39:6 43:11 51:19,21 set 9:18 55:3 66:13 48:5,11 54:12 55:9 71:5 73:16,20 119:9 55:15 57:7 62:19 74:14 80:20 83:1 84:19 85:15,19 86:3 138:2 149:6 186:2 63:4 64:3,6,11 88:20 219:13 241:8 242:21 90:22 91:8 95:19 86:18,21 87:4,8 269:14 280:6 96:6 100:17 101:9,15 90:14 92:5 93:17 103:12.15 146:15.20 104:20 109:5 111:19 significantly 68:1 111:21 173:20 174:1 92:11 265:16 272:8 184:12,14,18 185:1 similar 9:22 10:2,2,4 189:5 208:15 253:4 178:13 26:7 35:19 57:9 253:10.17.21 254:4 **SETH 3:2 5:7** 260:4 272:14 274:18 similarity 169:6 sets 24:19 146:11 simple 30:20 252:12 274:21 281:5 282:13 setting 50:2 83:7,20 282:20 283:1 285:15 85:12 88:6,12 93:11 272:13 simply 37:21 92:6 93:19 111:14 145:2 291:1,6,9 292:8 seven 19:16 209:3 103:18 129:5 145:18 293:2.11 248:2 250:7 257:17 199:19 286:10 287:6 slight 26:9 sliver 286:22 290:4 257:22 Simson 130:21 seventh 234:9 **simulation 27:5 32:8** sloppy 209:18 simulcast 262:6,8,12 small 24:3 38:15 70:14 several 15:6 41:2.16 140:12 142:19 143:1 43:2 130:22 142:2 simulcasters 157:12 simulcasts 261:22 163:15 164:19,22 175:16 290:15 199:12 266:2 286:12 sgreenstein@constan... 262:17 3:6 Sinatra 139:2 286:22 287:10 shaded 175:17 180:11 Sinatra's 128:22 288:22 289:1 290:20 181:15,16 129:10 290:20 share 37:7,10 147:11 since 39:4 41:12 52:6 smaller 19:14 27:12 157:12 181:11 238:8 163:16 165:7 183:2 77:2.15 153:12 175:17 200:19 238:11 288:13 196:8 sharing 13:16 225:9,12 218:20 291:19 SMITH 2:5 72:21 snapshot 21:2,5 285:7 225:14,20 226:6,8 singing 129:11 single 10:4 113:4 267:2 social 30:18 273:1 shed 99:9 267:10 289:6 software 187:13,14 sheets 268:14 188:7 sink 118:6 shift 81:16 108:10 sir 39:15 97:6 106:18 sold 33:15 49:3 59:17 234:4 235:8 251:10 108:6 124:20 125:14 147:4 shipments 141:22 252:12 273:6 126:17 144:1 166:7 180:12 202:3 218:13 shopping 287:20 Sirius 147:5,11 151:8 **Shores 4:4,4** 157:2 276:9,22 sit 95:1 98:2,16 176:9 solve 47:9 short 6:9 193:17 220:9 244:10 254:1 solves 101:11 283:20 some 12:17 13:8 16:10 show 10:19,22 23:5 site 188:3 18:3 20:7 29:15,16 situation 52:22 133:10 26:5 39:7 90:11 38:21 39:9 43:20 118:2 127:21 128:12 134:2 156:18 157:5,6 159:18 207:17 241:4 51:14 60:13 64:8 134:2 238:21 244:12 73:19 74:10 80:1 showed 38:6 222:21 situations 54:10,16 92:8 132:1 203:1 91:11 99:9 106:11 241:22

116:4,8 120:17 128:15 129:2 130:9 131:20 133:5 137:3,9 138:22 139:5 148:22 151:3 158:21 174:11 175:11 179:11 184:8 185:6,21 186:11 187:10 190:4,11 203:9 208:9 216:8 223:20 224:4 229:20 233:19 238:4 239:12 245:16 246:1,4 249:18 261:6 265:5 267:12 269:14 275:6 276:6 277:21 279:3 282:4 284:10 286:19 289:2,18 292:16 somebody 129:2 146:3 243:16 268:1 somebody's 47:13 129:3 somehow 83:12 someone 137:3 179:10 222:13 234:16 244:4 someone's 290:21 something 22:5 31:1 33:12 46:2 50:9 61:12 68:13 77:1 84:5 85:22 108:6 129:21 130:18 153:16 161:10 178:13 191:22 202:9 207:13 223:8 228:5 265:20 267:15 269:3 269:13 278:8,11,20 278:22 284:8,9 290:14 sometimes 72:16 76:4 166:7 275:7,12 somewhat 61:21 84:4 somewhere 180:20 217:5 257:16 song 32:19 44:1,6,11 81:2 127:22 132:22 133:22 137:4 139:2 144:10,10 146:5 178:21 songs 79:13 81:3 145:20 song-by-song 146:8 Sony 6:8 37:2,3,7,10,11 62:6 79:9 99:7,11 117:22 183:2 193:14 196:2 sophisticated 163:14 sorry 55:12 72:9 89:16 103:7 107:15 119:20 120:16 126:4 145:19 182:14 195:22 201:17 209:17

214:22 232:16 233:6

234:18 235:5 243:3,5 244:13 245:9 254:22 257:15 259:22 261:5 273:4 sort 23:20 38:1 41:4 42:20 43:4,12 52:20 53:3,5 56:12 57:3 58:16 62:2 106:5 129:21 148:7 155:19 230:10 241:8 288:17 289:3 290:18 sorts 37:4 sought 93:10 98:7 139:1 155:20 sound 1:6 2:2 7:15,20 40:19 42:1.8.15 44:13 45:4,7,9 46:6 48:16 49:5.7.8 50:4.5 50:8,17,18,21 51:5 51:10 52:6 53:9.22 54:18 55:1.21 56:7 59:10 60:10.18 67:22 70:19 80:16 83:14 84:11 85:7 88:13 89:7 90:11 92:3.10 100:3 105:21 106:9 106:17 107:9,13,22 112:16,20 113:1 114:17 115:10 116:1 116:17,21 117:4,8,10 118:11,14 121:4,10 121:11,17,18 122:8,9 122:11,12 123:6,11 123:21 124:1,5,21 125:12 126:3,5,8 127:6,8,17,21 128:3 128:14,19 129:12 130:15,21 131:12,19 131:21 133:6,9,13,18 134:1 136:5,11 137:1 137:2,15 138:3,11,12 138:14,19 139:11 143:14,17 145:13,14 147:22 150:16 159:21 160:12,16,20 161:12 162:3 164:4 180:22 183:7,14,16 188:19 189:1,12,20 193:2 196:17 197:1 200:17 201:17 204:8 204:21 207:6 211:15 220:19 221:5 237:1 255:3 275:7 276:2,9 276:12 277:2,9,14 284:19 290:9 SoundExchange 2:11 sounding 131:4 sounds 231:15 248:10 source 141:2 246:3 sources 33:4 56:6

57:10 58:2,5,20,21

South 2:7 3:8 so-called 231:8 288:13 speak 47:16 187:5 286:22 speaking 14:1 97:14 124:19 specific 29:15,16 56:13 57:4,10,12,17 58:16 126:6 128:19 130:7 130:19 131:19 133:15 167:14 186:22 190:7,12 191:8 192:18 193:8 195:8,18 specifically 58:4 77:8 89:19 93:22 104:11 140:17 155:8 185:15 194:9 195:9 205:5 217:21 265:18 specificity 186:12 specifics 144:13 187:6 speculate 95:16 speech 88:19 speed 198:9,10 spending 19:6 290:21 spends 176:3 spent 177:10 210:10 228:12 spite 113:6 split 173:9,10,11 spoke 243:1 spoken 47:5 sponsorship 195:8 spreadsheet 15:18 248:19 249:6 253:2 255:2 270:8 square 74:3 stage 152:6 stages 162:2 stamped 99:22 193:18 **STAN 1:23** stand 8:9 42:20 77:6 138:6 standalone 197:9,11 208:4 standpoint 136:19 145:4 240:12 standpoints 136:18 start 12:9 33:7 43:12 64:21 started 123:9 252:20 253:15 255:22 257:5 257:21 258:5,10 259:6,11,13 270:16 starting 72:5 122:3 147:7 156:16 180:4 181:15,16 195:22 237:11 255:13 288:17 starts 120:3 185:9 196:2

state 148:5 287:10 statement 54:6 68:15 76:15 104:5 108:15 110:1 112:3,9 123:2 123:12 139:19 143:6 147:9 163:3,10,19 164:3,8,15 169:19 185:7.20 188:22 189:12 211:14,19,22 212:21 219:3 statements 134:8 151:18,20 234:11 States 179:14 station 146:4 216:19 262:6,12,17 stations 2:15,16 35:13 207:7,10 262:8 statistic 239:22 statistical 15:8 31:8 32:5 238:5 239:20 240:1,16,18 241:6,20 statistically 240:11 stats 15:8 status 68:20 109:12 111:6 statutes 91:13 statutory 10:6 82:2 83:13 84:5,20 88:3 154:1,10 157:20 160:21 steadily 141:3 steady 285:4 Steinthal 4:2 6:4 46:12 47:9 48:3 54:4 55:6 55:12 57:5 63:5 64:13,14,20 71:11,19 72:19 73:1,2 81:11 81:15 89:3 92:13 95:20,21 96:9,11 99:5,15,21 100:18,19 101:12,20 102:2 103:16,17 119:20 120:1 132:7,10,15,18 146:12,21 147:1,3 182:4,7,8 185:4 189:3,7,11,14,16 193:10 194:2 208:13 215:19 275:5 276:7 281:6.8.10 282:11 291:4 292:14 293:4,7 293:8 still 39:3,5 76:22 79:9 82:17 85:20 86:16 128:2 144:21 145:11 149:14,20 150:1 157:10 288:4,4,7 290:6,7 Stones 75:2 stop 88:9

store 187:17 216:5

273:2

stores 124:3.6 story 41:3 269:12 stratifying 177:15 stream 66:4 147:15,17 195:13 204:12 205:16,22 207:9 234:19 235:1,21 242:15 255:14 streamed 24:10 108:13 246:12 255:11 260:16,20 262:5,11 streaming 24:14 25:7 65:12 66:10 67:10 111:4 142:10 255:22 289:22 streams 93:5 Street 2:6 3:4,8 4:8,22 5.8 strike 27:17 54:5 199:6 272:9 striking 29:8 strong 32:7 145:22 146:9 169:9 stronger 230:11 structure 60:15.22 61:7,13,14,15,16,21 62:12,13,16 203:7 204:17,18,21 205:13 206:7 structures 285:10 studied 68:6 75:16 studio 132:21 133:17 145:19 studios 133:21 144:7 study 6:17 46:14 64:15 130:5,10 131:7 132:1 178:14 220:12 222:20 224:5 226:8 226:20 228:6 240:10 Subgroup 230:17,18 subject 55:14,19 72:5 82:11 88:11,13 96:2 96:4.14.16 108:14 111:13 117:22 118:19 124:15 130:4 136:12 139:15,20 146:14 162:20 186:10 204:3 210:18 211:4 281:20 289:11 subjects 147:4 **submit** 92:16 subparagraph 197:1 200:21 subpart 125:16 subscribe 17:21 19:3 20:2 25:3,5 177:21 188:11 197:19 221:13 224:22 229:8 243:12,18 245:15 246:2 254:20 subscribed 17:11 19:18

19:20 20:1,16 22:22 222:11 229:6,15,19 230:19 231:1 232:11 232:12 233:1.2 234:18 243:9,20 244:3 245:7,11 246:11 247:9,10,13 247:13,18,22 248:6 249:8,10,13 250:7,8 250:13,14,20 251:14 251:19,22 255:17 258:9 273:2 subscriber 19:12 21:5 243:15 subscribers 18:9.11 24:17,22 25:1 199:9 219:20 220:10 223:11 224:9 225:3 228:20 229:3.14.18 233:9 235:13 243:2.6 243:7 244:1 246:18 246:21 247:1.3 248:6 249:1.17.20.22 250:6 250:18 251:4 252:3.5 252:10,13 257:9.10 subscribes 219:6 subscribing 21:11 230:3 242:16 subscripted 234:15 subscription 13:14 16:11 19:7 21:20 37:18 56:8 61:2 141:12,16 148:13 151:22 169:2 170:1,8 170:10 171:2,6,6 175:6 177:18 199:20 201:8 211:14 212:2 219:9 232:20 233:18 235:20 246:14 subscriptions 142:9 substantial 70:17 80:17 290:7 substitutability 10:21 78:13,16 136:13,16 136:20 138:3,7 143:7 143:19 144:21 145:3 145:12.16.17 substitutable 134:21 135:6,15 137:5 **substitute** 10:11 75:15 79:5 85:17 128:14 133:4,6 215:15 218:19 substituted 272:5 substitutes 50:21 51:5 78:9 81:1 135:21 143:16 289:15 **substitution** 11:7,13,22 12:4,7 13:4 22:1 23:21 26:16,22 28:17 28:19,21 31:21 32:8

280:7.19.20 286:19 substitutional 34:22 35:4 46:10.16 48:2 213:14 225:8,12,19 subtract 232:15 sued 110:13 sufficient 159:3 SUGARMAN 4:14 suggest 31:1 suggested 174:17 suggestions 283:7 suggests 213:13 suite 2:7,12 3:13 4:8,22 5:13 198:13 sum 154:14 155:3,5,9 155:13,15 156:5 162:13 255:18 256:3 258:17 summarize 70:21 73:22 summarized 69:16 70:6 71:6 78:7 summary 136:9 sunk 118:18.21 120:6.7 120:10.18 139:22 supplemental 184:5 supplier 168:6 suppliers 134:20 135:12,22 supply 126:1 127:4,12 159:7 support 161:10 170:7 197:10 supportable 31:3 supported 169:3 170:16 175:5 212:1 suppose 120:18 127:20 supra 86:12 surcharge 62:15 203:14 sure 14:16 32:16 65:22 66:13 70:12 76:20 86:20 96:22 99:13 104:3 106:4 108:18 114:1 122:2 135:2 142:16 153:2 155:7 156:1 164:6 178:18 182:7 184:12 192:19 212:5 220:8 235:22 246:15,22 267:18 283:14 surprise 268:15 surrounding 153:14 292:22 survey 12:8,11,22 13:8 13:11,12,19 14:4,7,8 14:10,12,16,20 15:7 15:12,20 17:4 18:14 18:20 19:22 20:4,14 21:10 22:5,6,11 25:7 25:12 27:7.9 30:17 31:13 226:14 228:16

212:5 265:11.12 253:12 274:22 281:3 163:22 170:18 179:5 229:6 237:17 240:20 193:13 194:21 180:17 188:1 192:10 241:5 247:15.19 197:21 198:1 199:15 273:20 283:20.21 285:14 290:22 291:7 196:22 197:4,15 terms 25:21 38:16 62:9 thankful 7:6 248:1 255:10 256:1 232:15 234:1,3 199:3.16 200:5 203:4 243:21 285:7 288:10 82:9.15 83:19 84:19 Thanks 184:17 259:18 257:6 258:1,6,11 203:6 204:16 205:7 105:20 108:5 122:13 Thanksgiving 7:5 259:8 261:11,12,21 292:10 262:9,16 263:9 266:3 taken 71:21 105:2 122:17 128:5 145:12 their 11:12 13:14 14:18 208:2,11 216:22 220:3 223:5,9 229:5 266:5 277:20 278:12 137:13 208:8 256:2 150:7 158:14 166:3 15:9,10,21 16:16 258:1,6,11 259:8 170:11,17 173:12 34:1 73:8,9 79:5 80:1 241:12 251:11 surveys 12:13 22:16 271:21 272:12 278:7 265:11,13 277:21 280:20 281:13 190:12 220:4 230:6 81:22 82:4 83:19 278:12,18 279:4,19 84:4 95:3,7 99:4 suspect 287:14 takes 56:4 192:6 228:5 238:9 246:4 134:1 141:2,6 142:22 280:16 282:2 284:2 267:16 276:18 terrestrial 148:11 Susquehanna 5:3 284:13 285:5,6 sustained 21:15 48:12 taking 57:16 171:15 157:11 214:7,21,22 144:8 146:11 150:2 288:16 289:7 290:6 55:16 96:7 174:9.11 200:9 215:1,6,12 261:22 151:14,15,17,21 290:13 292:8 154:21 158:10,14 sustaining 29:4 201:11 238:7 257:6 262:21 263:4 162:17 163:6 173:11 thinking 160:10 163:6 swallow 202:22 262:9,16 284:18 test 225:21 252:9 271:12,16,17 272:11 178:10 207:2 219:9 282:15 switch 179:2 talk 40:14 79:17 testified 7:21 8:14 28:6 222:13 227:22 thinks 48:8 switches 186:1 114:13 140:11 166:6 third 75:14 201:4 switching 39:16 277:16 229:21 232:19 241:5 29:14 68:6 79:13 167:17 196:20 241:11 244:4 265:21 206:12 207:1,3,8,21 81:7 162:6 175:13 sworn 7:21 203:17 252:17 197:4 217:9 229:12 268:3,5 281:20 246:10 248:13 SX 6:19,21 99:22 270:6 talked 48:9 74:17 78:16 80:4 81:5 testifying 8:21 27:22 288:19 289:21 thirdly 79:6 **SXREB 221:6** 104:8 112:10 160:15 theirs 241:9 Thirteenth 2:6 SX003097-8 6:15 113:7 129:8,17,19 theme 127:22 128:20 Thirty 259:22 228:9 260:22 SX003099-100 6:22 Thirty-four 269:18 talking 43:19 67:7 testimonies 47:4 131:14 SX003145 6:13 testimony 9:10,15 themselves 134:14 Thirty-two 260:1 76:12 84:16,18 SX003149 6:12 100:20 105:20 122:7 10:15 11:17 17:2 179:18 193:13 269:17 SX022RR 211:16 26:18 27:14,20,22 262:10 285:12 THOMAS 2:5 SX18392 193:18 122:8,10 125:2 135:9 29:19 30:17 39:18,19 theoretical 51:14.19 though 88:12 90:13 250:22 260:15 283:4 SX18397 194:22 42:12 47:13,13 55:19 theorized 225:18 113:18 198:3 205:13 sync 131:4 284:6,11 285:20 56:20 59:2 69:12 theory 40:13 41:7,12 238:13 240:6 290:4 synch 109:4,6,14 288:7 291:20 113:20 114:7 117:17 target 10:12,22 11:8 73:17 76:22 78:8 52:5,13 282:4,8 thought 84:22 150:6,7 thing 13:1 49:20 87:10 24:18,21 226:17 80:3,16 81:12 83:11 150:9 162:4 189:7,15 130:14 132:4,22 83:16 84:9,22 86:20 123:3 152:4 203:16 241:12 251:9 261:16 134:4 136:21 138:5 tariff 185:14 246:12 257:11 281:8 278:9 292:19 138:12 139:9 143:8 **TAYLOR** 4:6 274:20 88:18 92:19 99:1 143:12 144:18,22 100:20 101:5 103:3 281:11 thoughts 283:12 291:13 things 17:17 40:10 45:7 three 19:15 33:4 60:22 145:10 techniques 241:6,6 103:20 104:6 110:3,4 synchronization 268:4 110:20 111:1 122:16 53:16 66:1 115:19 61:7,20 141:18 142:6 117:18 136:5 technology 178:16 127:15 130:11,20,21 154:20 159:6 167:7 152:17 161:6 204:22 218:9,17 239:8 synchronized 195:12 telecom 185:22 130:22 142:12,15,16 187:15 192:4 195:8 System 3:17 think 14:14 20:11 25:2 247:14,18 249:9,10 television 40:22 147:7 160:18 168:21 S.E 1:14 tell 8:2 23:10,13 24:17 170:6 175:2,10,14,18 28:10 29:7 37:14 258:13 267:1 270:22 184:4 185:8 186:9 39:3 42:22 43:4 threw 89:7,12 27:2 34:20 35:10 T 187:4,16,22 188:7,20 48:20 49:2,13,18,19 through 13:17 14:8 41:2 42:12 99:20 113:19 131:16 160:3 193:11 194:6 197:8 52:13.15 65:5.7 23:18 34:6 35:6,9 tab 228:8 199:11 203:11 204:7 67:15 68:11 70:10 39:9 56:7,8 72:4,11 table 6:11,13,14,21,22 170:12 221:9 17:3 27:7 89:1 telling 174:4 209:1 211:12 212:16 72:2 74:16 78:12 73:8 84:21 89:21 213:21 217:17 218:2 79:18 80:10 83:3 92:15 124:5 126:8 tabs 15:17 tells 25:7.11 27:4 159:20 160:4 166:19 218:9 224:2 230:14 86:2 88:21 89:11,13 141:4 165:3 201:4 taint 85:8 tainted 83:12,18 84:1 232:9 240:4 242:12 89:17 91:8 92:1,14 206:12 207:8 255:7 239:9 temporary 89:19 252:8 263:2 276:8,15 95:7 96:19,22 97:1 265:9 269:14 275:17 84:13 280:4 282:6 take 10:7 17:6 25:19 209:21 210:4 277:16 278:8 279:5 100:9 101:10 104:18 throughout 34:11 37:9 52:18,22 55:18 ten 36:14 44:21 45:17 285:19,20 289:19 106:3 107:7,11 108:1 57:3 61:20 62:14,20 throw 158:17 62:20 91:15 172:5 291:7 108:7 113:2,11,22 67:17 71:12 72:1 199:2 290:21 testing 31:8 115:7 123:8,9 124:8 Thursday 79:19 76:9 81:22 82:7 89:4 tend 35:1 198:4 223:6 tests 31:16 240:7 125:8 126:18 132:16 tie 145:10 89:21 93:2 101:2 280:2 285:12 241:10,21 134:16 135:1 136:17 time 22:11 23:15 64:8 136:18 137:18 68:7,18 69:11 75:6 107:12 108:6 116:14 tended 23:16,17 Thank 7:9,14 22:17 76:1 81:7 130:6 138:20 141:20 143:3 117:8 119:11 124:10 tendency 269:9 30:5 62:17 64:10,14 145:17 146:12 148:8 139:17 146:6,13 72:17 119:22 175:15 129:9 136:19 140:8 tends 131:5 term 50:12 70:13 76:18 193:4 208:14,16 149:5,14 154:7,19 147:21 150:18,22 143:5 172:9 184:15 151:14,21 152:8 234:10 235:8 241:14 155:21 158:15 188:18 189:6 190:14 134:17 148:6 155:18

153:6 154:12 155:17 157:3 160:10 167:18 168:15 176:4,6 184:15,15 190:5 199:14 211:3 217:12 228:12 246:9 247:8 247:10 248:16 249:21 250:2,8 252:10 256:17 257:21 259:20 277:9 278:6 283:10 285:12 290:17,21 times 112:21 181:16 tip 289:4 titles 76:1,4 80:1 146:11 today 47:16 92:19 95:2 98:2,16 176:9 186:10 209:12 210:1 291:14 **TODD** 3:2 4:10 together 53:21 58:10 58:14 110:20 166:8 181:14 told 237:16 238:2 269:12 Tom 291:22 tomorrow 7:11 63:8 291:12,18 292:6 tone 41:19 43:7,9,17,18 44:22 45:21 46:7 49:6 54:22 55:4 68:22 69:11 74:20 75:1,2,20 76:6 77:2,8 78:14 79:6,8,19 97:20 99:3 101:7 102:5,8 103:9 116:8 116:14 138:8 275:6 276:1 tones 6:8 44:3,6,10,20 46:9,15 47:15,22 48:17 68:10 75:12 76:5,16 78:12,17,19 79:12 90:5 91:14 94:4,8,20 95:5,10 96:14 97:4,18 98:8 98:19 99:4,8 100:22 103:5 104:1,10 116:6 138:1 274:9,12 top 17:10 26:7 76:13 119:19,21 197:2 211:13 286:3 topic 11:16 190:5 214:18 total 35:8,14,17 183:10 218:12,21 231:7 235:18 236:12 237:4 237:6 249:1 252:19 256:6 totaling 237:14 totally 157:1 202:9 towards 161:20

Tower 3:13 track 87:19 90:3 104:19 179:22 180:1 tracks 35:15,16 36:14 217:1,2 tractable 195:15 tracts 217:9 trade 241:8 traditional 207:10 227:11 transaction 49:22 transactions 124:9 139:14 144:20 transcript 218:1 translate 150:13 transmissions 262:1 transposed 200:12 travel 292:19 treated 262:16 286:1 treating 205:21 Tremaine 4:22 trend 113:3 252:10 trick 235:9 tricky 61:22 tried 53:5 126:10 tries 56:5 trouble 85:6 119:13 troubled 200:8 true 23:15 39:8 68:19 69:8,14,18,22 74:8,9 74:11,13 76:6,22 78:5 79:11 81:19 93:16 106:18 115:10 115:15 116:4,5,7,9 116:11 118:10 119:7 125:4 135:4,20 142:14 144:15 146:2 146:7 154:13 156:3 174:7 178:15 179:5 193:7 214:11 222:8 232:22 233:7 237:10 237:15 244:1 245:6 245:22 248:4 255:20 261:20 266:2 274:8 280:10,15 282:1 286:3 287:7,18,18 trv 13:2 15:1 16:10 23:14 26:2 30:9 60:12,12 65:4,22 81:9 99:11 107:19 108:3,8 126:13 132:17 135:3 139:10 153:18 156:1 162:9 169:14,18 177:14 202:16 224:13 227:12 286:16 289:10 290:2,3 trying 20:12 21:22 23:11,11,13 30:22 46:3 53:9 56:9 57:3,9

57:16 65:21 66:1

108:6 152:21 160:9 182:20 225:22 242:5 246:14 251:5 252:8,9 261:4 265:4 283:19 283:22 286:10 Tuesday 63:16 tune 43:20 tunes 43:21 44:5 tuning 205:22 turn 17:1 42:10 99:22 139:21 163:9 167:16 184:1 189:17 196:22 208:22 211:11 213:10 214:2 218:5 242:11 246:10 259:15 272:18 285:18 turns 14:6 15:17 36:4 TV 41:6 48:19 49:17 50:22 127:21 128:12 twelve 247:22 248:2 250:7 257:17.22 270:12 Twenty-seven 189:2 twice 223:12 two 11:4,7 12:1 19:17 22:15 26:22 27:4,11 27:13 28:22 30:11 31:21,22 32:8 35:12 41:10 43:6 45:7 49:14 52:2 57:11 63:18 70:14 76:4 79:13 85:13 104:15 109:19 112:19 121:1 125:20 128:16 136:17 142:6 150:21 176:17 180:16,19 182:17 184:11 204:22 211:9 217:20 218:19 221:19 233:16 235:17 249:7 250:14 251:14 252:3 259:7,11 288:3 289:16 two-one 34:17 two-part 62:12 TX 3:9 type 16:3 19:16 43:14 169:7,8 179:11 200:2 266:7,10 279:22 types 13:5,13 15:19 25:13 91:22 113:10 113:11 196:5 280:3 284:22 typical 36:15 43:21 101:7,13 typically 43:22 80:8,11 119:4 239:9 T-test 238:4 239:16,20 240:3,13

U Ulman's 130:20 ultimate 45:1 129:6 151:21 ultimately 88:6 97:18 101:3 159:19 unable 31:14 unbranded 207:14 unbundle 60:13 128:15 197:12 unbundling 199:21 204:6 uncertain 157:19 158:3 158:7 uncertainties 158:9 159:13 160:1 uncertainty 57:19 148:22 149:7 152:10 158:21 159:5,10 under 20:7 43:13 60:18 82:17 83:21 84:20 88:6 90:13 91:12 93:12 94:5,13 97:5 101:7 102:13 104:20 125:22 160:21 205:21 243:9 247:6 267:1 290:8 underlying 124:11 159:13 undermine 31:5 242:21 underprice 287:6 understand 52:5 70:4 70:12 95:1 98:22 125:17 126:10,13 135:2 144:3 148:17 153:2 155:8 159:4 160:9 164:6 171:13 172:10 178:18 201:15 216:13 261:4 261:11 265:4 275:16 understanding 45:18 45:22 46:8 47:21 48:7 68:17 69:4 76:18 79:1 86:19 94:21 100:20 104:6 105:17 109:2 157:4 210:3,8,17 211:2,7 242:2 246:17 248:18 264:12,17,19,22 265:10 273:12.13 understood 28:13 135:12 undertake 126:6 127:11 undertaken 133:5 unfortunately 248:20 292:1 unique 34:2,8 49:20 175:16,19,20,22 176:2 177:3,16 uniqueness 49:19

unit 168:1.2 171:20 181:7 United 179:14 units 145:9 Universal 110:12 Universal's 145:14 universe 173:17 177:3 177:15 199:17 unknown 159:7.8 233:20 unless 277:13 Unlimited 66:9 unrelated 134:13 unsure 246:19 until 76:11 146:16 293:12 unwilling 31:16 uplift 204:4 upper 72:3,10 upset 95:2 upside 212:7 up-sell 170:1,7 up-sold 170:15 usage 204:4 use 9:17,19 10:3 11:3 12:5 13:13 16:20 21:1 22:1 35:19 38:21 48:18 49:6 52:3,8,19 55:4 56:7 60:16 62:11 66:22 67:1 69:6 70:13 76:18 79:4 83:22 85:20 97:10 99:4 102:3,12 106:16 113:13,20 127:20 129:20 130:14 131:3 132:4,19 133:2,22 136:6 138:13 139:9 141:21 143:8,12 144:18 145:1,10,20 148:6 154:10 155:18 160:5 178:10,16 183:1 196:9,14 197:3 199:9,14,19 200:14 201:1,3 203:11 226:21 238:4 248:21 268:4 273:20 279:1 used 11:4 13:2 29:1 40:21 41:18 53:14 84:12 122:13,16 144:11 175:7 176:3 187:13 196:10 197:17 225:13 227:1 227:17 235:12 239:11 245:5 263:8 265:12 274:1 280:8,9 280:11.12 287:13 useful 278:13 user 44:1 52:8 147:17 178:21 users 53:11 86:10

124:20 136:22 143:13 170:8 178:6 179:6,7,11 199:20 uses 59:17 146:3 212:5 using 17:22 36:2 38:4 50:15 65:18 67:4 88:10 89:1 115:11 122:14 179:4 181:19 199:18 205:5 240:19 245:20 280:17 281:1 usually 75:22 120:8,9 utility 223:7 utilization 153:5 utilizing 197:11 239:15 U.S 14:17 15:2 218:8 218:13 227:4

v

valid 40:6 validity 31:9 40:4 152:19 153:13 valuable 207:20 value 47:14 59:8 60:12 83:19 84:6 107:7,9 107:19,21 131:6 137:8,14 161:3,16 177:8 199:21 202:10 valued 42:3 60:4 61:18 values 48:16 49:14 90:11 139:11 value-added 134:17 valuing 59:12 Van 3:19 variability 241:18 242:7 266:3 variable 73:13 variables 224:15 variety 43:13 53:15 various 12:6 13:5,13 31:15 32:18 239:17 285:13 vehicle 207:8 venue 178:2 Verizon 99:7 versus 114:6 137:9 140:9 278:14 280:12 very 16:21 18:12 24:3 26:6 29:15,16 32:7 35:5 38:15,15 41:3 58:3 59:7 61:22 72:16 73:10,10,12,14 76:19 78:2 92:1,9 102:6 112:17,19 114:22 115:7 136:2 137:4 145:21 147:16 152:5,5,7 169:9 179:8,16 190:14 199:12 202:2 203:8,8 209:2 218:20 219:16 227:11 241:4,8 265:5 272:1,13 278:20

285:6,8 286:12 289:22,22 290:4 via 33:10 34:15 88:11 191:17 viable 78:3 video 41:20 69:15 106:19 107:15,20 108:9 109:8 117:19 118:1 187:15 194:16 195:9,10,12,13,16,22 196:3,7 videos 105:19 106:1,13 108:12 109:20 117:15 118:6 195:7 196:2 274:9 view 49:15 51:19 61:9 67:8 82:14 115:14 212:16 215:10 261:3 278:4 viewed 121:16 125:4 125:13 227:22 276:9 views 47:2 48:10 95:7 virtually 67:20 131:5 166:20 167:1 virus 198:14 visual 106:20 107:5,6 107:20 voir 55:10 volume 1:11 130:3 voluntarily 206:1 voluntary 83:17 84:10 88:14 89:5 147:22 148:15 149:9 157:2 157:22 196:14

w

204:20

wait 76:11 want 37:10 38:20 64:22 70:12 88:15 98:17 100:11 117:8 125:16 127:20 128:19,21,22 129:1,2 138:11 142:16 144:14 175:11 193:13 wanted 18:10 67:3,6 68:16 75:1,2 94:12 117:2,13 138:19 143:8 185:5 217:4 wants 49:5 129:10 131:12,16 146:5 Warner's 145:13 warrants 102:15 **Washington** 1:2,15 2:8 2:13,19 3:5,21 4:9,23 5:9 8:8 wasn't 75:8 84:9 120:18 172:7,15 205:17 226:15 266:9 266:12 way 14:3 15:4 37:6

38:22 39:4 51:3 57:20 60:13 76:22 98:3,4 105:7,9 107:4 120:9,15,17 123:15 126:13,14 130:8 131:18 133:15 135:3 135:12 137:10,11,17 149:11 172:20 175:1 182:21 193:6 200:4 202:11,16 203:5 209:9 210:14,16 215:21 222:8,20 230:9,10,13 241:12 248:19 249:5 261:3 263:20 268:11 277:10 280:4,4,5,5 280:21 286:15 289:5 ways 27:10 28:4,5,6 53:15 56:10 63:12 179:3 202:20 203:19 265:7 web 14:7 35:9 webcast 11:11 16:12,13 191:18 197:20 215:21 219:15 290:9 webcaster 206:14.20 webcasters 65:1 147:10 157:9,12 164:20 165:1,2 194:5 279:6 webcaster's 205:1 webcasting 1:9 9:20 10:13 13:15 25:9,16 25:20 34:21 37:16 41:17 67:5,8 68:5 74:16 76:2 81:6 82:8 82:11,15 84:20 85:16 85:19 86:6 93:4,6 94:3 140:5,9,13 141:4 148:4,8 152:20 177:8 186:6,13 194:14 207:10 212:1 212:2 213:14 214:21 215:1,11 219:7 224:10,22 229:7 233:4,12,15,20 235:12 236:3 252:18 253:15 254:17,19 279:1 280:8,13 281:1 285:21 289:3,21 290:8 webcasts 18:9 32:18,19 website 24:11,14 25:8 74:22 177:11 187:18 206:22 207:2 216:2 234:19 235:2,4,7

242:15 246:13

256:18 257:2,22

websites 73:8 217:20

255:11,14,22 256:10

260:16,21 262:5,11

256:12 258:5 259:7

website's 207:21 Wednesday 292:7 week 64:17 291:16,21 293:6 weekend 7:4 weeks 35:18 217:13 weight 42:22 163:16 227:1,18 weighted 221:22 227:3 227:6,7,11 weighting 267:12 Weil 4:3,7,11,15 5:18 WEINSCHEL 5:17 welcome 7:4 22:19 251:16 well 13:16 14:18 18:2 21:18 25:10 27:4 29:12 30:15 35:5 43:9 50:16 54:5 56:9 58:1 77:1 84:9 89:8 95:9 96:9 97:12 100:10,13 109:13 116:12 120:10 129:18 131:1,7 132:13 137:4 142:4 144:4 148:19 149:20 151:6 153:4 154:19 160:8.17 164:8 165:13 167:8 170:12 172:19,19 188:6 191:15 199:11 203:3 204:14 205:12 209:2 209:17 219:10 221:8 225:21 226:7 227:5 230:6 231:3 233:14 243:14 251:13 253:16 257:12 265:1 276:17 277:7 287:17 well-recognized 128:1 went 74:22 75:7,7 77:4 89:18 255:7 were 14:13 16:18 18:4 19:1,6 23:15 27:20 30:12,22 31:3,16 35:21 36:9,14,15 37:2 44:4,4,9,13,14 45:2 48:14 52:16 53:7,9,20 54:1 63:6 66:15 67:4 68:20 72:6 75:6 76:14 77:7 89:17 96:14 100:22 104:12,12 109:19 110:13 113:5 125:2 130:4 132:2 139:15 139:16 141:18 142:5 142:13,14 150:16 151:6,7,8,9 152:21 152:22 153:9 160:9 162:10 163:6.6 164:22 170:15 171:19,20 172:2,14

173:21 174:21 177:7 202:2 203:19 206:19 209:13 210:18,22 211:2 213:8 215:5 222:3 225:17 227:21 228:7 229:2 234:11 237:16 238:14 240:10 241:3,5,10 245:20,21 246:1 248:20 249:20 252:4 256:9,11,17 257:1 258:4 260:15 263:17 264:1,5,14 266:16 273:7,16 275:4,5 276:6 277:6,9,14 278:9 279:3,16,20 281:12 284:6 287:7 288:7 weren't 53:2 213:7 230:3 240:8 246:20 we'll 62:21 63:7 118:18 134:11 146:16,21 184:14 189:3 203:15 231:3 244:15 253:5 291:12,17 we're 20:15 21:22 43:19 63:8 67:7 76:12 87:5 92:15 114:12 120:12,16 122:8 160:8 180:17 181:18 182:10,15,22 202:11 203:17 246:15 253:18,21 257:8 278:21 280:17 283:22 285:11 291:20 we've 43:11 104:14 113:7 115:9 170:19 229:5 283:4 284:11 289:18 we/shouldn't 140:4 whatsoever 54:7 131:10 Wheeler 7:13 While 253:4 white 206:19 207:22 208:2 whole 28:11 52:1 114:1 125:17 126:10 127:2 127:10 166:13 219:8 219:14 223:2 227:10 227:14 245:18 282:3 284:11 wide 12:13 Wiley 5:8 WILLIAM 1:22 3:18 willing 53:12 79:4 126:14,15 166:17,21 167:3,22 168:1 171:5

171:19,21 172:13

10016 4:12 156:6 162:1,10,14 250:13,20 251:7 99:4 104:10 108:11 173:3 174:14 227:21 252:20 253:15 258:6 10153 4:16 5:19 204:8 205:10,12,20 109:1 112:16,22 228:7 209:8,16,17,18,19 willingness 166:10 113:2 122:7 123:11 258:10.12 259:12 102 255:18 256:3 104 255:18 256:7,9,14 210:4,9,22 211:3,8 125:12,13 143:14,16 272:3 278:14.15 167:11,13 173:2,11 years 12:12 141:19,21 20036 2:13 256:21 275:8 276:3,8,14,19 200:10 109 231:12 232:11 20036-4306 3:21 world 20:14 197:21 142:2,6,6,7 152:17 willr@ktru.org 3:10 155:14 204:22 211:9 248:5 2004 20:7,19 21:2,7 worth 134:14 158:11 Wilshire 3:13 11 119:11 120:3 221:20 251:19,21 200:6 202:13 290:12 250:14 251:14 252:4 WISNIEWSKI 1:23 114 83:21 157:7 252:4,14 264:15 290:15.20 259:7,11 267:2 271:1 22:3,9,17 132:7,12 115 88:7 94:6 268:14,22 270:14 worthwhile 286:6 271:8 182:2,5 189:10,13 1152 255:13 271:9 278:20 wouldn't 17:1 63:13 York 4:12,12,16,16 266:7,12 283:3,18 69:14,18,22 70:18 5:19,19 287:16 1155 3:19 2005 13:22 20:1,2,7,18 285:3,14 12 63:16 64:12 119:12 21:1,3,7 33:20 34:3,7 witness 6:2 7:11,16,19 74:21 117:7 123:18 \mathbf{z} 22:7,12,19 55:7 57:8 145:2 148:4,19 167:16 189:17 34:8 35:18 84:22 zero 38:16 247:14 149:17 158:17 167:1 234:20 247:11 217:14,22 218:13 81:14 88:21 91:11 173:18 178:22 249:19 263:14,22,22 220:1,12 221:20 100:15 103:13 \$ 264:1.13 272:1 223:1 243:7 248:8 119:22 184:10,13,17 179:10 200:8 206:2 241:3 283:14 284:2 208:1 241:2 261:13 \$1 180:8,10 181:7,17 12.5 219:22 252:4,14 255:17 182:11 12:31 146:17 256:12,17,22 257:1 285:5 286:9 287:4,17 Wright 4:22 writing 227:16 **\$1.10** 168:2,7,9,13 1200 2:7 263:10,11,15,18 288:16 290:6 291:8 13 72:5 189:20 192:21 264:14 267:3,6 268:9 written 17:2 29:19 171:21 172:2,2,7,15 witnesses 213:21 39:18 42:11 47:4 173:5 174:6.10 271:14,18 268:13,20 270:18 wmalone@millervan... 271:3,9 278:17 3:22 53:18 69:12 139:19 **\$10** 180:14 1300 4:8 \$12 202:13 1330 2:12 **WOOD 5:7** 163:9 187:4 193:11 2005-1 1:6 2006 1:17 271:3 293:15 **\$2.5** 180:21 181:10 word 84:1 120:17 209:1 211:12 212:15 **138** 232:16 14 122:4 196:22 200:22 201 4:4 183:7,20 143:18 156:2 170:2 242:12 202 2:8,13,22 3:5 4:9 wrong 136:17,18 182:1 **\$20** 175:5 **15** 63:17 64:12 122:3 234:2,3 \$4.99 219:21 220:11 wording 212:11 246:15 176:11,15,19,22 5:9 211:12 212:20 **202.508.6656** 4:23 words 11:6 66:17 129:5 wrote 212:15 221:14 222:14 202.513.2049 2:20 228:21 229:15 230:8 1500 4:22 201:22 248:7 260:20 X 231:6 233:19 234:16 **158** 258:18 202.785.0600 3:21 264:14 269:11 276:2 20540 1:15 280:1 X 144:17 145:9 166:18 244:5 279:12,22 16273:4 \$5 184:2,4 17 213:11 214:3 **21** 64:12 213:19 214:4 work 42:2,9,16 45:14 167:11 \$7 202:12 171 258:18 214:8 46:6 50:6,19 52:7 **XLIV 1:11** XM 147:5,11 151:8,18 \$9 167:22 168:6 171:20 1776 5:8 21st 64:4,5 53:22 68:2 69:7 172:6,11,13,14 173:4 **212** 4:13,17 5:20 85:18 86:4 88:10 157:2 **18** 214:4 90:3,4,12,13 92:4,11 174:5,9,14 **182** 258:17 259:5,10 248:16 **217** 255:18 256:3 19 76:14 215:17 216:8 92:21 94:7 97:6 Yahoo 4:2 33:6 36:20 **22** 120:3 218:5 224:3 **192** 231:7 232:17 105:15 106:21 107:5 #1000 3:20 22RR 211:19 36:20,21 37:1,4,17 193 6:9 107:9,13,13 109:10 220 6:11 37:21 38:3 62:7 66:3 109:21 111:5 114:18 23 224:1,3 66:8,9 117:22 162:21 117:6 118:11,15 0.014 38:7 2 33:5 45:9 134:11 **231** 6:13 121:5 124:18,22 163:5,11 164:16 0.02 34:16 36:6,18 139:21 196:6 197:2 236 6:14 166:2 170:1 178:6 127:17 128:2,6,13 183:8 192:3,6 193:15 0.2 21:8 32:4 36:15 200:21 218:22 245:7 238 6:16 129:4,14 130:13 194:19 195:5 196:5 0.3 32:4 285:19 24 224:1 237:11 271:14 133:1,2,9 134:5 003149 221:6 2:00 146:16 271:18 196:11 198:11,12,19 136:5 138:12,16 003948 100:2 2:03 146:19 **240-3514** 3:5 139:3 145:7 164:5 207:1 2:48 184:20 244 6:19 Yahoo's 37:16,18 172:21 185:21 222:7 20 175:14 180:4 **25** 37:11 61:6 71:13,17 170:10 228:2,4 230:15 232:2 1 33:5 45:8 84:21 Yahoo-Sony 6:9 200 237:18 238:3,14 226:10 267:3 268:1 275:22 277:3,6,12 134:10.13 239:10 268:12,13 271:2,3 year 11:5,8 13:22 19:9 285:11,12 10 90:4 166:6 167:21 2000 152:20 **25.9** 267:6,8 268:8,20 19:10,19,21 20:2,6 worked 200:20 248:19 21:8 22:14,15 23:1 171:19 172:11,13,17 20001 2:19 268:21 271:9 working 38:5 185:14 173:16,22 174:4,9 20005 2:8 4:9.23 23:14 33:16,18 34:11 **254** 6:21 225:7 34:16,18 36:6,16 181:4,12,15 184:16 20006 3:5 5:9 **26** 228:18 242:12 works 40:1,19 44:16,19 199:12 218:8,15 2001 130:5,10 131:8 260 6:19 45:20 47:1 48:16 38:8,9 68:9 145:11 10K 151:19 2002 163:14 269 6:22 184:2 218:9,18 53:5,9 54:19 69:3 **27** 1:17 17:2 193:22 **10:36** 63:1 2003 84:19,21 89:7 230:20 231:1,13,14 70:15 80:22 82:10 10:49 63:3 148:21 149:8 150:22 **273-9807** 3:14 232:11,12 237:12 85:20 87:18 90:5 100 232:16 275 6:3 91:22 93:7 97:10 243:10 247:6 250:2 153:1,10,12 155:11

28 221:1,8 232:4 274:3	423 252:19 256:7	9.1 87:19 90:2 104:19		
293:15	444-7700 5:14	105:12,16		
281 6:4	45 251:18	9/19/06 6:16		
29 231:20 232:2 243:22	450 4:22	9:30 1:19 293:12,15		
268:1		9:34 7:2		
	5	90 168:1,9 171:20		
3	5 102:6 143:6	173:21 174:5,11		
3 33:6 140:11,21 196:6	5th 4:12	199:16		
239:1 276:8 286:3	5.04 100:5 101:3,21	90/10 173:9		
3A 270:17	102:10	900 4:8		
	5.1 108:21 109:22	90212 3:14		
3C 270:17	111:7	9100 3:13		
	5.5 21:7	93 258:18		
1	5.7 21:6	94065 4:4		
	5:28 293:13	99 6:8 179:21 180:8		
· ·	50 45:11	33 0.0 173. 2 2 200.0		
	513-2049 2:22			
	567 4:12			
242:1 248:14 266:22	307 4.12			
4	6			
270:16	6 6:3 147:7,18 194:21			
3099 270:6	244:13,14 6.5 108:21 109:22			
	60 236:13 237:6,10			
31st 68:8 71:21	270:22			
	601 2:6			
1	604 258:4 259:3,5			
	61 230:22			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	6100 3:8			
	615 3:13			
	635 2:18			
	639-6060 2:8			
	64 6:4			
	650 4:5		:	
319 255:21 256:5,7,16	682-7024 4:9			
32 76:10,13,14 187:12				
244:20 245:2 249:8	7			
257:20 259:16,21	7 152:15 153:22 156:12			
260:5,11 272:19	156:16 208:22			
33 76:10,13 77:9	237:14			
	71 6:6			
	713 3:9			
	719-4913 5:9			
	74 248:6 249:13,19			
348-2935 3:9	250:1			
	7464 5:13			
	767 4:15 5:18			
	77 230:18			
	77005 3:9			
4	8			
	8 237:14			
	801(b) 160:21 162:12			
	802-3100 4:5			
	80303 5:14			
115:10 136:9,10	80303 5:14 828-0126 2:13			
115:10 136:9,10 4(a) 195:3	828-0126 2:13			
115:10 136:9,10 4(a) 195:3 4,000 14:13,14	828-0126 2:13 83 231:13 232:12 251:7			
115:10 136:9,10 4(a) 195:3 4,000 14:13,14 4:24 253:7	828-0126 2:13			
115:10 136:9,10 4(a) 195:3 4,000 14:13,14 4:24 253:7 4:31 253:9	828-0126 2:13 83 231:13 232:12 251:7 251:10,13			
115:10 136:9,10 4(a) 195:3 4,000 14:13,14 4:24 253:7 4:31 253:9 40 12:12	828-0126 2:13 83 231:13 232:12 251:7			

Transcript of:

Date: November 27, 2006 Volume: 44

Case: Digital Performance Rights

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. Phone: 202-234-4433

Fax: 202-387-7330

Email: info@nealrgross.com Internet: www.nealrgross.com